

# भारत का राजपत्र

## The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० ४३] मई बिल्ली, शनिवार, अक्टूबर २८, १९६८/कार्तिक ४, १८९०

No. 43] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1968/KARTIKA 4, 1890

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह प्रालय संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सते।

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

भाग II—खण्ड ३—उपखण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(एका मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ क्षेत्र प्रशासन को छोड़कर) केन्द्रीय प्राधिकरणों द्वारा जारी किए गए विविध घावेश और अधिसूचनाएं।

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministers of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administration of Union Territories).

MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION

(Department of Cooperation)

New Delhi, the 18th September 1968

S.O. 3729.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5B of the Multi-Unit Cooperative Societies Act, 1942 (6 of 1942), the Central Government hereby directs that the following amendment shall be made in the notification of the Government of India in the former Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Cooperation) No. S.O. 1593, dated the 28th June, 1961, published at page 1555 of part II Section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India of 8th July, 1961, namely:—

In the said notification against serial No. 19 for the existing entry 'Shri M. Shivanna', the entry 'Shri K. Lamphal Singh' shall be substituted.

[No. 7-4/68-Credit.]

V. V. NATHEN, Deputy Secy.

(4799)

(Department of Agriculture)

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 17th October 1968

S.O. 3730.—In the notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation, (Department of Agriculture) No. S.O. 1646 dated the 29th April, 1968, and published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii), at page 2181—2184.

- (a) at page 2181, in rule 5(2), line 5, for "मर्तिय उत्तरात्" read "भारतीय उत्पात्"
- (b) at page 2182, in the Table in line 2, for "shall be in and" read "and shall be in".
- (c) at page 2184, under Schedule II, in line 1, for "puality" read "quality".

[No. F.13-14/68-L.A.(Pt.)]

R. SUBRAHMANIAM, Under Secy.

स्वास्थ्य, परिवार नियोजन एवं नगर विकास मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य एवं नगर विकास विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 अक्टूबर, 1968

एस० ओ० 3731.—ग्रीष्म एवं ग्राम अधिनियम, 1940 (1940 का 23) की धारा 33-ग की उप-धारा (7) द्वारा प्रश्न शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा स्वास्थ्य, परिवार नियोजन एवं नगर विकास मंत्रालय में स्वदेशी चिकित्सा पद्धति के सलाहकार आ० पी० एन० वो० कुलप को स्वास्थ्य, परिवार नियोजन एवं नगर विकास मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या 4-1/58-ग्रीष्म दिनांक 4 अक्टूबर, 1968 के अधीन गठित आयुर्वेदीय तथा यूनानी ग्रीष्म तकनीकी सलाहकार बोर्ड का सचिव नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० प० 4-1/68-ग्रीष्म]

एस० ओ० 3732.—ग्रीष्म एवं ग्राम अधिनियम 1940 (1940 का 23) की धारा 33-ग की उप-धारा (1), (2) और (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 1 अक्टूबर, 1968 से निम्नांकित सदस्यों का एक आयुर्वेदीय तथा यूनानी ग्रीष्म तकनीकी सलाहकार बोर्ड गठित करती है और स्वास्थ्य सेवाओं के महानिदेशक को उसका अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है।

धारा 33-ग की उप-धारा (2) के खण्ड (i) से (IV) तक के अधीन पद्धन सबस्यः

1. स्वास्थ्य सेवाओं के महानिदेशक
2. ग्रीष्म नियंत्रक, भारत
3. स्वदेशी चिकित्सा पद्धतियों के सलाहकार, स्वास्थ्य, परिवार नियोजन एवं नगर विकास मंत्रालय (स्वास्थ्य एवं नगर विकास विभाग)
4. निदेशक, केन्द्रीय ग्रीष्म प्रयोगशाला, कलकत्ता

धारा 33-ग की उप-धारा (2) के खण्ड (VI) के अधीन समोनीतः

आ० पी० एन० मेहरा, बनस्पति विभाग के प्राध्यापक तथा अध्यक्ष, पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय, घण्डीगढ़।

धारा 33-ग की उप-धारा (2) के खण्ड (VII) के प्रधीन मनोनीत :

डा० (श्रीमती) असीम चटर्जी, कलकत्ता विश्वविद्यालय, कलकत्ता के रसायनविभाग व अध्यक्षा ।

धारा 33-ग की उप-धारा (2) के खण्ड (VIII) के प्रधीन मनोनीत :

1. डा० सी० एस० उस्मारायन, प्रधानाचार्य, गवर्नरमेट कालेज आफ इन्डियन मेडिसिन, पलायमकोटे, तिहुनवेली ।
2. डा० डी० ए० कुलकर्णी, प्रधानाचार्य, आर० एम० डिग्री आयुर्वेदिक कालेज, कोटी बौसमण्डी, बरेली ।

धारा 33-ग की उप-धारा (2) के खण्ड (IX) के प्रधीन मनोनीत :

वैद्य विश्वनाथ द्विवेदी, प्राध्यापक, गुजरात आयुर्वेद विश्वविद्यालय, जामनगर ।

धारा 33-ग की उप-धारा (2) के खण्ड ( ) के प्रधीन मनोनीत :

हकीम शकील अहमद यासी, हकीम अब्दुल अर्जीज रोड, लखनऊ-3 ।

धारा 33-ग की उप-धारा (2) के खण्ड (XI) के प्रधीन मनोनीत :

1. वैद्य राम नारायण, प्रबंध-निदेशक, श्री वैद्यनाथ आयुर्वेद भवन प्रा० लिमिटेड, ज्ञासी ।
2. हकीम इकबाल अहमद, हमदम दवाखाना, लालकुंआ, दिल्ली-6 ।

धारा 33-ग की उप-धारा (2) के खण्ड (XII) के प्रधीन मनोनीत :

1. वैद्य पी० नारायण वैद्यन माधव फार्मसी, एर्नाकुलम ।
2. हकीम यसुफ दुसेनखां, “दारूल-अवाम” 789-मुग्सपुरा, हैदराबाद-2 ।

[सं० प० 4-1/68-श्रीष्ठ]

एस० के० मूर्ति,  
अवर सचिव भारत सरकार ।

**MINISTRY OF FINANCE**  
**(Department of Economic Affairs)**

*New Delhi, the 16th October, 1968.*

**S.O. 3733.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, as on the 11th October, 1968.**

**BANKING DEPARTMENT**

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid up . . . . .	5,00,00,000	Notes . . . . .	17,36,78,000
		Rupee Coin . . . . .	2,66,000
Reserve Fund . . . . .	80,00,00,000	Small Coin . . . . .	3,62,000
		Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . .	143,00,00,000	(a) Internal . . . . .	..
		(b) External . . . . .	..
		(c) Government Treasury Bills . . . . .	215,92,11,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund . . . . .	33,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad* . . . . .	107,88,64,000
		Investments . . . . .	125,85,19,000
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . .	55,00,00,000	Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) Central Government . . . . .	..
		(ii) State Governments@ . . . . .	86,14,26,000
Deposits:—		Loans and Advances to :—	
(a) Government		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks† . . . . .	64,41,82,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks†† . . . . .	201,74,72,000
		(iii) Others . . . . .	3,30,78,000

(i) Central Government . . . . .	59,41,32,000	Loans, Advances, and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund:—	
(ii) State Governments . . . . .	5,21,03,000		
(b) Banks:—		(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
		(i) State Governments . . . . .	31,62,18,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	15,20,11,000
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks . . . . .	148,64,61,000	(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks . . . . .	
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	7,02,23,000	(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	8,53,61,000
		Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	1,23,20,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	5,34,04,000
(iv) Other Banks . . . . .	17,30,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund:—	
(c) Others . . . . .	322,83,57,000	(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank . . . . .	6,18,23,000
Bills Payable . . . . .	27,58,94,000	(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank . . . . .	
Other Liabilities . . . . .	37,09,59,000	Other Assets . . . . .	35,63,04,000
	Rupees 925,21,79,000		Rupees 925,21,79,000

\*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

\*\*Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 50,33,38,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 16th day of October, 1968.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 11th day of October, 1968.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	17,36,78,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation . . . . .	<u>3249,89,65,000</u>		(a) Held in India . . . . .	115,89,25,000	
TOTAL Notes issued	3267,26,43,000		(b) Held outside India . . . . .	..	
			Foreign Securities . . . . .	226,42,00,000	<u>3267,26,43,000</u>
			TOTAL . . . . .	342,31,25,000	
TOTAL LIABILITIES	<u>3267,26,43,000</u>		Rupee Coin . . . . .	81,90,50,000	
			Government of India Rupee Securities . . . . .	2843,04,68,000	
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other Commercial paper . . . . .	..	
			TOTAL ASSETS . . . . .	3267,26,43,000	

(Sd.) B. N. ADARKAR,

Dy. Governor.

[No. F. 3(3)-BC/68.]

V. SWAMINATHAN, Under Secy.

## (Department of Revenue and Insurance)

## CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 26th October 1968

**S.O. 3734.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Customs Act, 1962, (52 of 1962), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Finance (late Department of Revenue) No. 36, dated the 1st February, 1963, namely:—

In the said notification, for the entry "Collector of Customs and Central Excise, Coal" against item (vii), in column 2, the entry "Collector of Customs, Bombay" shall be substituted.

[No. 150/F.No. 22/3/68-Cus.IV.]

J. DATTA, Dy. Secy.

## CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

## INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 9th October 1968

**S.O. 3735.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf and in supersession of all the previous notifications in this regard the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax of the ranges specified in column 1 of the Schedule below shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and incomes assessed to Income-tax or Supertax in the Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts specified in the corresponding entry in column 2 thereof:—

## SCHEDULE

Range	Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts	
	1	2
<b>A-Range, Amritsar</b>		
	<p>1. In respect of orders passed by Income-tax Officers upto and including 14-7-1967.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Distt. I, Amritsar.</li> <li>(ii) Distt. II(i) to II(v), Amritsar.</li> <li>(iii) Distt. III (iv), Amritsar.</li> <li>(iv) Special Survey Circle, Amritsar [in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Distt. I, II and III (iv), Amritsar].</li> <li>(v) Salary Circle, Jullundur [in respect of persons who reside in the jurisdiction of Distt. I, II and III (iv), Amritsar].</li> </ul> <p>2. In respect of orders passed by the Income-tax Officers after 14-7-1967.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Distt. I(i), Amritsar.</li> <li>(ii) Distt. I(ii), Amritsar.</li> <li>(iii) Addl. Distt. I(ii), Amritsar.</li> <li>(iv) Distt. I(iii), Amritsar.</li> <li>(v) Addl. Distt. I(iii), Amritsar.</li> <li>(vi) Distt. I(iv), Amritsar.</li> <li>(vii) Distt. I(v), Amritsar.</li> <li>(viii) Addl. Distt. I(v), Amritsar.</li> <li>(ix) Distt. I(vi), Amritsar.</li> <li>(x) Addl. Distt. I(vi), Amritsar.</li> </ul>	
<b>B-Range, Amritsar</b>		
	<p>1. In respect of the orders passed by the Income-tax Officers upto and including 14-7-1967.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) District III(i), III(ii), III(iii), III(v) and III(vi), Amritsar.</li> <li>(ii) Central Circles, I, II, III, Amritsar.</li> <li>(iii) Central Circle, Ludhiana.</li> <li>(iv) Central Circle, Ambala.</li> <li>(v) Special Survey Circle, Amritsar [in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Distt. III(i), III(ii), III(iii), III(v) and III(vi), Amritsar, Central Circles I, II, III, Amritsar and Central Circle, Ludhiana].</li> </ul>	

(vi) Special Survey Circle, Patiala (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business, in or reside in the jurisdiction of Central Circle Ambala).

(vii) Salary Circle, Jullundur (in respect of persons who reside in the jurisdiction of Distt. III(I), III(ii), III(iii), III(v) and III(vi), Amritsar, Central Circles I, II, III, Amritsar).

2. In respect of orders passed by the Income-tax Officers after 14-7-1967.

- (i) District II(i), to II(iv), Amritsar.
- (ii) Central Circles, Amritsar.
- (iii) Central Circles, Ludhiana.
- (iv) Central Circles, Ambala.

**C-Range, Amritsar . . . . .**

- 1. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having Headquarters at Batala.
- 2. All income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having Headquarters at Amritsar other than those mentioned in column 2 above against A-Range, Amritsar and B-Range, Amritsar.
- 3. Special Survey Circle, Amritsar (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Batala).
- 4. Salary Circle, Jullundur (in respect of persons who reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Batala).

**Jullundur . . . . .**

- 1. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having headquarters at Jullundur.
- 2. Special Survey Circle, Amritsar (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officer, Jullundur).
- 3. Salary Circle, Jullundur (in respect of persons who reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Jullundur).

**A-Range, Ludhiana . . . . .**

- 1. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having headquarters at Hoshiarpur.
- 2. A-Ward, Ludhiana.
- 3. Aidl. A-Ward, Ludhiana.
- 4. B-Ward, Ludhiana.
- 5. Addl. B-Ward, Ludhiana.
- 6. Special Survey Circle, Amritsar (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers Hoshiarpur, A-Ward, Ludhiana, Addl. A-Ward, Ludhiana, B-Ward, Ludhiana and Addl. B-Ward, Ludhiana).
- 7. Salary Circle, Jullundur (in respect of persons who reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Hoshiarpur, A-Ward, Ludhiana, Addl. A-Ward, Ludhiana, B-Ward, Ludhiana and Addl. B-Ward, Ludhiana).

**B-Range, Ludhiana . . . . .**

- 1. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having Headquarters at:

  - (i) Khanna,
  - (ii) Moga.

- 2. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having Headquarters at Ludhiana other than those mentioned in column 2 above against A-Range, Ludhiana and except Central Circles, Ludhiana.
- 3. Special Survey Circle, Amritsar (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Khanna, Moga and Income-tax Officers at Ludhiana other than those mentioned in column 2 above against A-Range, Ludhiana).

<b>A-Range, Patiala</b>	4. Salary Circle, Jullundur (in respect of persons who reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Khanna, Moga and Income-tax Officers at Ludhiana other than those mentioned in column 2 above against A-Range, Ludhiana).
	1. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having Headquarters at:— (i) Chandigarh, (ii) Sangrur. 2. Companies Circle, Patiala. 3. B-Ward, Patiala. 4. Addl. B-Ward, Patiala. 5. C-Ward, Patiala. 6. Special Survey Circle, Patiala (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Chandigarh, Sangrur, Companies Circle, Patiala, B-Ward, Patiala Addl. B-Ward, Patiala and C-Ward, Patiala). 7. Salary Circle, Jullundur (in respect of persons who reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Chandigarh, Sangrur, Companies Circle, Patiala, B-Ward, Patiala, Addl. B-Ward, Patiala and C-Ward, Patiala).
<b>B-Range, Patiala</b>	1. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having headquarters at:— (i) Bhatinda, (ii) Ferozepur. (iii) Abohar. 2. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having headquarters at Patiala other than those mentioned in column 2 above against A-Range, Patiala. 3. Special Survey Circle, Amritsar (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Ferozepur and Abohar). 4. Special Survey Circle, Patiala (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers Bhatinda and Income-tax Officers at Patiala other than those mentioned in column 2 above against A-Range, Patiala). 5. Salary Circle, Jullundur (in respect of persons who reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Bhatinda, Ferozepur, Abohar and Income-tax Officers at Patiala other than those mentioned in column 2 above against A-Range, Patiala).
<b>Ambala</b>	1. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having headquarters at:— (i) Ambala, except Central Circle, Ambala. (ii) Yamunanagar. (iii) Karnal. (iv) Panipat. (v) Simla. (vi) Mandi. 2. Special Survey Circle, Patiala (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the Districts of Ambala, Karnal, Simla and Mandi). 3. Salary Circle, Jullundur (in respect of persons who reside in the Districts of Ambala and Karnal).
<b>A-Range, Rohtak</b>	1. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having headquarters at:— (i) Hissar (ii) Jind (iii) Sirsa. 2. A-Ward, Rohtak.

3. B-Ward, Rohtak.  
 4. Companies Ward, Rohtak.  
 5. Special Survey Circle, Patiala (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Hissar, Jind and Sirsa and Income-tax Officers, A-Ward, Rohtak, B-Ward, Rohtak and Companies Ward, Rohtak).  
 A-Range, Rohtak . . . . . 6. Salary Circle, Jullundur (in respect of persons who reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Hissar, Jind and Sirsa, Income-tax Officer, A-Ward, Rohtak, B-Ward, Rohtak and Companies Ward, Rohtak).  
 B-Range, Rohtak . . . . . 1. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having headquarters at:—  
     (i) Gurgaon.  
     (ii) Faridabad.  
     (iii) Sonepat.  
 2. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having headquarters at Rohtak other than those mentioned in column 2 against A-Range, Rohtak.  
 3. Special Survey Circle, Patiala (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Gurgaon, Faridabad, Sonepat and the Income-tax Officers at Rohtak other than those mentioned in column 2 against A-Range, Rohtak).  
 4. Salary Circle, Jullundur (in respect of persons who reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Gurgaon, Faridabad, Sonepat and the Income-tax Officers at Rohtak other than those mentioned in column 2 against A-Range, Rohtak).  
 Jammu . . . . . 1. All Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts having headquarters at:—  
     (i) Jammu.  
     (ii) Srinagar.  
     (iii) Pathankot.  
 2. Special Survey Circle, Amritsar (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Pathankot).  
 3. Salary Circle, Jullundur (in respect of persons who reside in the jurisdiction of Income-tax Officers, Pathankot).

Where an Income-tax Circle, Ward and District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one Range to another Range, appeals arising out of assessments made in that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Range, from whom that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall, from the date this notification shall take effect, be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 9-10-1968.

*Explanatory Note*

The revision of jurisdiction has become necessary on account of creation of new appellate ranges in the Commissioner's charge.

(The above note does not form a part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory).

New Delhi, the 11th October 1968

**S.O. 3736.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Incometax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf and in supersession of all previous notifications in this regard the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Incometax of the Ranges specified in Column 1 of the Schedule below shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and incomes assessed to incometax or supertax in the Incometax Circles, Wards and Districts specified in the corresponding entry in column 2 thereof.

## SCHEDULE

Range	Incometax Wards, Circles and Districts
1	2
A-Range, Bombay . . . . .	Company Circle II and Film Circle.
B-Range, Bombay . . . . .	Company Circle I
C-Range, Bombay . . . . .	Non-residents Refund Circle, A-IV, Evacuee Circle I, Foreign Section, Bombay Circle and Special Investigation Branch I to III.
B-Range, Bombay . . . . .	Evacuee Circle II and Company Circle IV(I) to IV(9)
E-Range, Bombay . . . . .	D-I and A-I Wards
F-Range, Bombay . . . . .	B-II and D-II Wards
G-Range, Bombay . . . . .	B-I and 1st 2nd and 3rd I.T.Os of Bombay Suburban District (West)
H-Range, Bombay . . . . .	Bombay Suburban District (West) except 1st 2nd and 3rd I.T.Os charges.
I-Range, Bombay . . . . .	A-II and C-IV
J-Range, Bombay . . . . .	Company Circle III(I) to III(7) and III(12) to III(15).
K-Range, Bombay . . . . .	A-III and Company Circle III(8) to III(II)
L-Range, Bombay . . . . .	B-III and C-I
M-Range, Bombay . . . . .	E-Ward
N-Range, Bombay . . . . .	C-III and A-V
P-Range, Bombay . . . . .	Hundi Circle and Special Investigation Branch IV
Q-Range, Bombay . . . . .	Bombay Suburban District (East) and G-Ward
R-Range, Bombay . . . . .	C-II, Salaries Branch I, Salaries Branch II and Bombay Refund Circle.
S-Range, Bombay . . . . .	Market Ward and Company Circle IV(10) to IV(16).

Where an Incometax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one Range to another Range, appeals arising out of assessments made in that Incometax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Range from whom that incometax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall from the date this notification shall take effect be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said circle, ward or district or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 14th October, 1968.

## Explanatory Note

The modification has become necessary on account of the posting of an additional A.A.C. in the Commissioners' charges.

(The above note does not form part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory).

**S.O. 3737.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf and in supersession of all previous notifications in this regard, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax of the Ranges specified in Column 1 of the Schedule below shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and incomes assessed to Income-tax or Super-tax in the Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts specified in the corresponding entry in Column 2 thereof.

## SCHEDULE

Range	Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts
1	2
A-Range, Madras	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City Circle I, Madras.</li> <li>2. City Circle III, Madras.</li> <li>3. City Circle V, Madras.</li> <li>4. City Circle VI, Madras.</li> <li>5. Foreign Section, Madras.</li> <li>6. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Madras.</li> <li>7. Tax Recovery Circle, Madras.</li> <li>8. Vellore Circle.</li> </ol>
B-Range, Madras	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Special Investigation Circle 'A', Madras.</li> <li>2. Special Investigation Circle 'B', Madras.</li> <li>3. Central Circles I to XVII, Madras.</li> <li>4. Cuddalore Circle (all sections).</li> </ol>
C-Range, Madras	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Companies Circle I (all Sections), Madras.</li> <li>2. Hundī Circle I, Madras.</li> <li>3. City Circle IV, Madras.</li> <li>4. Special Survey Circle (all Sections), Madras.</li> <li>5. Kancheepuram Circle.</li> </ol>
D-Range, Madras	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Companies Circle II (all Sections), Madras.</li> <li>2. Hundī Circle II, Madras.</li> <li>3. City Circle II (all Sections), Madras.</li> <li>4. City Circle VII (all Sections), Madras.</li> <li>5. Salaries Circle, Madras.</li> <li>6. Salaries Circle I, Madras.</li> <li>7. Salaries Circle II, Madras.</li> <li>8. Pondicherry Circle (all Sections).</li> </ol>
Tiruchirapalli Range	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tiruchirapalli Circle.</li> <li>2. City Circle I (all Sections), Tiruchirapalli.</li> <li>3. Company Circle, Tiruchirapalli.</li> <li>4. Pudukkottai Circle (all Sections).</li> <li>5. Thanjavur Circle (all Sections).</li> <li>6. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Thanjavur.</li> <li>7. Nagapattinam Circle (all Sections).</li> <li>8. Dindigul Circle (all Sections).</li> </ol>

Madurai Range

1. Madurai Circle.
2. Company Circle, Madurai.
3. Special Survey Circle, Madurai.
4. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Madurai.
5. Karaikudi Circle (all Sections).
6. Virudhunagar Circle.
7. Tuticorin Circle.
8. Tirunelveli Circle.
9. Nagercoil Circle.

Salem Range

1. Salem Circle.
2. Company Circle, Salem.
3. Circle I, Salem.
4. Circle II, Salem.
5. Erode Circle (all Sections).
6. Ootacamund Circle (all Sections).

Coimbatore Range

1. Coimbatore Circle.
2. Special Survey Circle, Coimbatore.
3. Special Investigation Circle, Coimbatore.
4. Circle I, Coimbatore.
5. Circle II, Coimbatore.
6. City Circle I (all Sections), Coimbatore.
7. City Circle II (all Sections), Coimbatore.
8. Central Circles I and II, Coimbatore.
9. All Company Circles, Coimbatore.
10. Salary Circle, Coimbatore.
11. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Coimbatore.
12. Pollachi Circle (all Sections).
13. Tiruppur Circle.
14. Excess Profits Tax Circles, Coimbatore and Erode.

Where an Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one Range to another Range, appeals arising out of assessments made in that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range from whom that income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall, from the date this notification shall take effect, be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from the 14th October, 1968.

*Explanatory Note*

The amendments have become necessary on account of formation of a new Appellate-Assistant Commissioner's Range known as 'B' Range with headquarters at Madras and consequential re-organisation of the circles.

(The above note does not form a part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory).

*New Delhi, the 15th October 1968*

**S.O. 3738.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following further amendments in the Schedule appended to its notification No. 12-Income-tax (F. No. 50/7/66-ITJ, dated the 14th January, 1966), namely:—

I. Against 'H' Range, Calcutta under Column 2 the following shall be substituted:—  
1. District-III(I)/Calcutta.

II. Against 'J' Range, Calcutta under Column 2 the following shall be substituted:—  
1. District-IV (1), Calcutta.  
2. Special Survey Circle-VI, Calcutta.  
3. District-VA, Calcutta.

III. Against 'O' Range, Calcutta under Column 2 the following shall be substituted:—  
1. District-VI, Calcutta.

IV. Against 'T' Range, Calcutta under Column 2 the following shall be substituted:—  
1. District-I (2), Calcutta.  
2. Special Circle-VI, Calcutta.

V. After 'X' Range, Calcutta, the following shall be added:—

'Y' Range, Calcutta—1. Project Circle, Calcutta.  
2. Central Salaries Circle, Calcutta.  
3. Railways and Miscellaneous Salaries Circle, Calcutta.  
4. Refund Circle, Calcutta.  
5. District IIIA, Calcutta.  
6. Project Circle I, Calcutta.

'Z' Range, Calcutta.—1. Companies District-I, Calcutta (appeal cases pending and which will be arising in 'A' Ward to 'F' Ward of the District).

'AA' Range, Calcutta—1. Project Circle-II, Calcutta.  
2. Estate Duty-Cum-Income-tax Circle.  
3. Special Circle-I, Calcutta.  
4. Special Survey Circle-I, Calcutta.  
5. Murshidabad.

This notification shall take effect from 17th October, 1968.

*Explanatory Note*

The amendments have become necessary on account of the creation of two new ranges of the AAC known as Y-Range, Calcutta, Z-Range, Calcutta and AA Range, Calcutta and consequent reallocation of the jurisdiction amongst the AACs in the Commissioners charge.

[No. 103 (F. No. 50/14/68-ITJ).]

*New Delhi, the 16th October 1968*

**S.O. 3739.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf and in supersession of all previous notifications in this regard, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax specified in Column 1 of the Schedule below shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and incomes assessed to income-tax or supertax in the Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts specified in the corresponding entry in column 2 thereof:—

SCHEDULE

Range	Incometax Circles, Wards and Districts
1	2
Central Range I, Bombay . . . . .	i. Sections I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII (Central), Bombay
Central Range II, Bombay . . . . .	i. Sections IX, X, XI, XIII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI and XVII (Central), Bombay

Where an Incometax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one Range to another range, appeals arising out of assessments made in that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range from whom that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall, from the date this notification shall take effect, be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 18th October, 1968.

*Explanatory Note*

The amendment has become necessary on account of the creation of a new appellate range in the Commissioner's charge.

(This note does not form a part of the notification, but is intended to be merely clarificatory.)

[No. 104 (F. No. 50/8/68-ITJ).]

New Delhi, the 18th October 1968

**S.O. 3740.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendment in the Schedule appended to its Notification No. 96 F. No. 50/13/68-ITJ) dated 5th October, 1968, namely :—

In the said Schedule against Range I and Range III, Meerut under column 3 the following shall be substituted :—

Range I, Meerut

1. A and B Wards, Meerut.
2. Project Circle, Meerut.
3. Najibabad.

Range III, Meerut

1. Central Circles, Meerut.
2. I.T.O., Collection, Meerut.
3. Bulandshahr.

This notification shall take effect from 23rd October, 1968.

*Explanatory Note*

The amendment has become necessary to confer on A.A.C., Range III, Meerut the jurisdiction over Central Circles at Meerut.

(The above note does not form part of the notification, but is intended to be merely clarificatory).

[No. 105(F.No. 50/13/68-ITJ).]

S. V. SUBBA RAO, Under Secy.

## CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE, KANPUR

Kanpur, the 24th August, 1968

**S.O. 3741.**—In exercise of the powers conferred on me under proviso to Rules 15 and 16 of Central Excise Rules, 1944, I hereby notify in the following schedule, the areas in which growers and curers of tobacco will be exempted from declaration of the area under tobacco cultivation and yield under Rules 15 and 16 respectively, provided that area cultivated and the quantity of tobacco cured by a grower/curer do not exceed the maxima specified in Cols. 3 and 4 of the schedule in respect of the areas notified in column 2 hereof. When the limits are exceeded it is obligatory on the part of the grower/curer to declare the particulars to the proper officer either personally or by registered post. The above exemption under Rules 15 and 16 of Central Excise Rules, 1944, will not apply to flue-cured tobacco and tobacco other than flue-cured, used in the manufacture of cigarettes, smoking mixture for pipes and cigarettes and biris.

Schedule showing revenue jurisdiction of areas in Kanpur Collectorate, exempted under rules 15 and 16 of Central Excise Rules, 1944.

Sl. No.	Name of Districts or portions thereof	Exempted areas in acres	Exempted qty. in Kgs.	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	Mahroni, Lalitpur, Girotha, Mauranipur, Moth & Jhansi Tehsils of Dist <sup>t</sup> . Jhansi . . . . .	5	60	
2.	Entire Jalaun and Hamirpur Districts . . . . .	5	60	
3.	Entire Kanpur Distt. except Tehsil Bilhaur . . . . .	5	60	
4.	Etawah . . . . .	4	60	
5.	Agra . . . . .	5	60	
6.	Mathura . . . . .	5	60	
7.	Aligarh . . . . .	5	60	
8.	Mainpuri . . . . .	5	60	
9.	Bulandshahr . . . . .	5	60	
10.	Entire Meerut Distt. . . . .	7	60	
11.	Entire Muzaffarnagar Distt. . . . .	7	60	
12.	Nakur and Gangoh Parganas of Nakur Tehsil in Distt. Saharanpur . . . . .	6	60	
13.	Chilkana pargana of Nakur Tehsil in Distt. Saharanpur . . . . .	7	60	
14.	Entire Tehsil Deoband of District Saharanpur . . . . .	6	60	
15.	Entire Roorkee Tehsil except Pargana Jwalapur of Roorkee Tehsil of Saharanpur District . . . . .	5	60	
16.	Pargana Jwalapur of Tehsil Roorkee of Distt. Saharanpur . . . . .	4	60	
17.	Dehradun Distt., except villages forming part of M.O.R. Hardwar . . . . .			Total exemption.
18.	Entire Tehri Garhwal Distt. . . . .			Total exemption.
19.	Entire Uttar Kashi Distt. . . . .			Total exemption.
20.	(a) Entire parganas of Fazipur, Bendaria, Ulaisahawar Sidpur except Village Sahawar, Sahawar proper, Sahlot and Dundhra of Kasganj Tehsil of Etah District . . . . .	5	60	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	(b) Entire parganas of Merhera, Etah, Sakitpur, Soner Bilram & Pachlana of Tehsil Etah Distt. Etah.		5	60
	(c) Entire pargana of Midpur of Tehsil Aliganj except villages Barhola, Dar-ka-nagla, Sonari & Merethi of Tehsil Aliganj of Distt. Etah			
	(d) Entire pargana of Patiali of Tehsil Aliganj except villages Ganjdundwara, Sujawalpur, Alipur, Dedar, Allahpur, Nagdavoo, Samaspur Barathi & Patiali town area		5	60
	(e) Entire Jalesar Tehsil except villages Uchagaon, Timarua, Sarai Neem, Bha and Jalesar proper.			
21.	Pargana Tirwa of Tehsil Kannauj and Parganas Sakrawa & Sakatpur of Tehsil Chhibrampur of Farrukhabad Distt.		5	60
22.	Entire Trans-ganges area of M. O. R. I Fatchgarh (Distt. Farrukhabad.)		5	60

[No. 5/68-CH.]

V. PARTHASARATHY,  
Collector.

**MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS**

(Department of Industrial Development)

**ORDER**

*New Delhi, the 16th October 1968*

**S.O. 3742/15/IDRA/68.**—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that there has been, or is likely to be a substantial fall in the volume of production in respect of cotton textiles manufactured in the industrial undertaking known as the New Commercial Mills Ltd. (No. 1 & 2), Ahmedabad; for which having regard to the economic conditions prevailing, there is no justification.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 15 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951), the Central Government hereby appoints, for the purpose of making full and complete investigation into the circumstances of the case, a body of persons consisting of:

1. Shri S. V. Kogekar—Chairman.
2. Shri M. G. Mirchandani—Member.
3. Shri R. G. Zalani—Member.
4. Shri A. R. Kher—Member.
5. Shri B. D. Mukherjee—Member-Secretary.

[No. 9(10)Lic.Pol./68.]

R. C. SETHI, Under Secy.

## (Department of Industrial Development)

## (Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 9th October 1968

**S.O. 3743.**—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955 the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Standard Mark, design of which together with the verbal description of the design and the title of the relevant Indian Standard is given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been specified.

This Standard Mark for the purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from 1st October, 1968 :

## THE SCHEDULE

Serial No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Product	No. and Title of the Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the Design of the Standard Mark
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I.	 Light Caoutchoucine	IS: 4117-1966 Specification for alcohol denaturants		The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters 'ISI', drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in col.(2), the number, designation of the Indian Standard being subscribed on the top side, and the words 'LIGHT CAOUTCHOUCINE' being subscribed under the bottom side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

[No. CMD/13:9.]

**S.O. 3744.**—In pursuance of sub-regulation (3) of regulation 7 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the marking fee per unit for Light Caoutchoucine, details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been determined and the fee shall come into force with effect from 1st October, 1968 :

## THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Product	No. and Title of Relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking Fee per Unit
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I.	Light Caoutchoucine	IS: 4117-1966 Specification for alcohol denaturants.	One litre	One Paisa

[No. CMD/13:10.]

**S.O. 3745.**—In pursuance of sub-regulations (2) and (3) of regulation 3 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been established during the period 16 to 30th September, 1968 :

**THE SCHEDULE**

Sl. No.	No. and Title of the Indian Standard Established	No. and Title of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any, super- seded by the new Indian Standard	Brief Particulars
1	2	3	4
1.	IS:1011-1968 Specification for Biscuits ( <i>First Revision</i> ).	*IS:1011-1957 Specification for biscuits (excluding wafer biscuits).	This standard prescribes the essential requirements, methods of sampling and test for biscuits baked from dough containing essential materials with or without the addition of other ingredients. (Price Rs. 5.50).
2.	IS:1067-1968 Specification for electroplated coatings of silver for decorative and protective purposes ( <i>First Revision</i> ).	IS:1067-1958 Specification for commercial silver-plating.	This standard specifies requirements for four grades of electroplated coatings of silver used for decorative and protective purposes. (Price Rs. 2.00)
3.	IS:1398-1968 Specification for packing paper, waterproof, bitumen-laminated ( <i>first revision</i> ).	IS:1398-1960 Specification for packing paper, waterproof, bitumen laminated.	This standard prescribes the requirements and methods of sampling and test for bitumen-laminated waterproof paper for general packaging. (Price Rs. 2.00).
4.	IS:2001-1968 Specification for fixed silvered mica capacitors ( <i>first revision</i> ).	IS:2001-1962 Specification for fixed silver mica capacitors.	This standard prescribes the requirements and methods of tests for judging the electrical, mechanical and climatic properties of fixed mica dielectric capacitors with deposited silver electrodes for use in electronic and telecommunication equipment. (Price Rs. 8.00).
5.	IS:3351-1968 Methods of test for diesel engine fuel filters.	..	This standard specifies the methods of test for determining the following requirements of diesel engine fuel filters and filter inserts, when in new condition : (a) Mechanical tightness, (b) Flow rate and pressure drop, and (c) Filtering efficiency. (Price Rs. 5.50).
6.	IS:4218 (Part I)-1967 ISO metric screws threads Part I basic and design profiles.	..	This standard deals with basic and design profiles for ISO metric screw threads. (Price Rs. 3.50).

**NOTE:** With a view to facilitate change over by Indian Standards Institution Certification Marks Licensees, IS:1011-1957 shall remain in force concurrently with IS:1011-1968 upto 31 December 1968.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
7	IS:4218 (Part V)—1967 ISO metric screw threads Part V tolerances.	..	This standard tabulates tolerances for ISO metric screw threads for the tolerance classes covered in Part IV of the standard, in the diameter range 1 to 300 mm. The tolerances have been arrived at based on the tolerancing system specified in Part IV of the standard. (Price Rs. 9.50).
8	IS:4563-1968 Specification for block squares.	..	This standard specifies the requirements of engineers precision block squares of the solid and hollow types (Price Rs. 3.50).
9	IS:4579-1968 Methods of measurements on television picture tubes.	..	This standard lays down procedures for measuring the basic parameters of monochrome television picture tubes. (Price Rs. 6.00).
10	IS:4584-1968 Specification for brushes, hair.	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of sampling and test for hair brushes manufactured from nylon monofilaments or bristles. (Price Rs. 3.50).
11	IS:4594-1968 Code of practice for design of portal and semi-portal wharf cranes (electrical).	..	This standard covers mechanical, electrical, inspection and testing requirements relating to the design, manufacture and erection of portal and semi-portal wharf cranes, level luffing derrick and fixed radius type. (Price Rs. 9.50).
12	IS:4603-1968 Specification for phenyl ethyl alcohol.	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of sampling and test for phenyl ethyl alcohol (Price Rs. 2.50).
13	IS:4616-1968 Specification for sheepfoot roller.	..	This standard lays down the requirements for materials, sizes, design, construction and performance of sheepfoot roller. (Price Rs. 3.50).
14	IS:4621-1968 Specification for indicating bolts for use in public baths and lavatories.	..	This standard lays down the requirements for indicating bolts for use in public baths and lavatories. (Price Rs. 2.50).
15	IS:4634-1968 Method for testing performance of batch-type concrete mixers.	..	This standard covers the method of test for assessing the performance of batch-type concrete mixers in terms of uniformity of constituents in the concrete mixed by the mixer. (Price Rs. 2.50).
16	IS:4635 (Part II)—1968 Method for determination of colour fastness of textile materials to vulcanizing Part II with sulphur monochloride.	..	This standard prescribes a method for determining the resistance of colour of textiles of all kinds and in all forms to the action of sulphur monochloride under the conditions occurring during the cold vulcanizing of rubber. (Price Rs. 2.00).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
17	IS:4639-1968 Glossary of petroleum terms.	..	This standard defines the terms used in the petroleum industry. (Price Rs. 11.50).
18	IS:4657-1968 Specification for ring device for artificial limbs.	..	This standard specifies the requirements pertaining to material shape, dimensions, workmanship, finish and performance for ring terminal device. (Price Rs. 2.00).
19	IS:4658-1968 Specification for coated paper and board (art and chromo).	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and methods of sampling and test for coated paper and board (art and chromo). (Price Rs. 3.50).
20	IS:4661-1968 Glossary of terms used in paper trade and industry.	..	This standard defines the terms commonly used in the paper trade and industry in this country. (Price Rs. 8.50).
21	IS:4663-1968 Specification for permanent rubber-based adhesives for footwear industry.	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and methods of sampling and test for permanent rubber-based adhesives used in footwear industry. These adhesives are used for bonding the soles of leather rubber or other elastomers of footwear to the middle sole or upper leather. (Price Rs 5.50).
22	IS:4664-1968 Specification for pulp board.	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and methods of sampling and test for pulp board. (Price Rs 2.00).
23	IS:4666-1968 Specification for electric passenger and goods lifts.	..	This standard applies to the construction and safety of new passenger and goods lifts suspended by ropes and employing a guided lift car. (Price Rs. 8.00)
24	IS:4669-1968 Methods of test for polyvinyl chloride resins.	..	This standard prescribes methods of test for polyvinyl chloride resins. (Price Rs. 5.50).
25	IS:4671-1968 Specification for expanded polystyrene for thermal insulation purposes.	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of sampling and test for expanded polystyrene in the form of rough shapes, finished boards and blocks, and pipe laggings for thermal insulation. They are primarily used in refrigeration and building applications in the temperature range—200° to 80°C. (Price Rs. 5.50).
26	IS:4672-1968 Specification for grease cups.	..	This standard lays down the requirements for grease cups for general purposes. (Price Rs. 3.50).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
27	IS:4682 (Part 1)—1968 Code of practice for lining of vessels and equipment for chemical processes Part I Rubber lining.	..	This standard lays down recommendations on lining of vessels and equipment with the various types of rubber and rubber like materials available and on the selection design, application, maintenance inspection and testing together with recommendations for design of equipment to be lined. (Price Rs. 7.50).
28	IS:4683-1968 Specification for chilled iron shot and grit for use in foundries.	..	This Indian Standard covers the requirements for chilled iron shot and grit. (Price Rs. 2.50).
29	IS:4685 (Part 1)—1968 Specification for varnish bonded glass-fibre covered copper conductors Part I round wires.	..	This standard covers the requirements and methods of test for single and double glass-fibre covered copper conductors of sizes from 0.250 mm to 4.000 mm, the glass-fibre being bonded with suitable highly polymerized thermosetting varnish. (Price Rs. 3.50).
30	IS:4687-1968 Specification for gland packing asbestos.	..	This standard covers the requirements of gland packing asbestos intended to contain gases, fluids and slurries at different temperatures and pressures. (Price Rs. 2.50).
31	IS:4689-1968 Specification for Enamel hatchet, dental, no.ch 1/2.	..	This standard specifies the requirements of dental enamel hatchet no.ch 1/2 (Price Rs. 2.00).
32	IS:4693-1968 Specification for steel accessories for marine piping systems.	..	This standard gives the material and dimensions for the following steel accessories for marine piping systems :
	(a) Threaded welding socket (b) Drain plug (c) Suction funnel (d) Collecting funnel (e) Changeover bend (f) General purpose clamp		(Price Rs. 3.50).
33	IS:4698-1968 Code of practice for seaworthy packing of unmanufactured cigarette type tobacco.	..	This standard covers the seaworthy packing procedure of unmanufactured cigarette type tobacco. It also prescribes the materials for packing in wooden cases and in jute gunny or hessian bales (Price Rs. 2.00).
34	IS:4711-1968 Methods for sampling of steel pipes, tubes and fittings	..	This standard prescribes the methods of sampling and the criteria for conformity for steel pipes, tubes and fittings. (Price Rs. 2.50).
35	IS:4714-1968 Specification for scalers, dental, no. sc 1/2, 3/4 and 5/6.	..	This standard specifies the requirements of dental scalers no. sc 1/2 3/4 and 5/6. (Price Rs. 2.50).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
36 IS:4716-1968 Specification for probes, dental, no. pr 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6/7 and 8/9.	..	This standard specifies the requirements of the following dental probes : (a) Probes pocket-measuring, dental, No. PR 1, 2 and 3, and (b) Probes, dental No. PR 4, 5, 6/7, and 8/9. (Price Rs. 4 00).	

Copies of these Indian Standards are available, for sale, with the Indian Standards Institution, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-1 & also its branch offices at (i) Bombay Mutual Terrace, Sandhurst Bridge, Bombay 7, (ii) Third and Fourth Floors, 5, Chawringhee Approach, Calcutta-13, (iii) Second Floor, Sathyamurthi Bhavan, 54, General Patters Road, Madras-2, (iv) 117/418-B, Sarvodaya Nagar, Kanpur, and (v) Industrial Estate Administrative Building, Sanatnagar, Hyderabad.

[No. CMD/13:2.]

(Dr.) A. K. GUPTA,  
Deputy Director General.

## MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

### CORIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 16th October 1968

S.O. 3746.—In the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 3246, dated the 28th November, 1967, published at page 4290, in the Gazette of India, Part II Section 3, sub-section (ii), dated the 14th September, 1968, for '28th November, 1967' after the words "New Delhi, the" read '4th September, 1968'.

[No. F.17(3)Tex(G)/68.]

H. K. BANSAL, Dy. Secy.

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

### ORDER

New Delhi, the 9th October 1968

S.O. 3747.—M/s. Coimbatore Pioneer Fertilizer Ltd., Peelamedu, Coimbatore-4, were granted licence No. P/RM/2155817/C dated 3rd January, 1967 from G.C.A. for import of spares valued Rs. 75,000/- They have requested for the issue of duplicate Customs purposes copy of the licence on the ground that the original Customs copy of the licence has been lost by them. It has been further reported by the licensee that the licence was lost after utilising Rs. 1,654/-. The licence has been registered with Collector of Customs, Madras.

In support of their contention, the applicant have filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Customs purposes copy of the licence No. P/RM/2155817/C dated 3rd January, 1967 has been lost and directs that a duplicate Customs purposes copy of the said licence should be issued to them. The original Customs purposes copy is cancelled.

The duplicate Customs copy of the licence is being issued separately.

To

M/s. Coimbatore Pioneer Fertilizers Ltd., Peelamedu, Coimbatore-4.

[No. Ch/1-3(79)AM 67/RM 3.]

G. D. BAHL,  
Deputy Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th September 1968

S.O. 3748.—M/s. The National Small Industrial Corporation Limited Near Industrial Estate, Okhla, New Delhi-20, were granted an import licence No. G/ST/2379276/S/27/H/22/CG II, dated 15th July 1968 for Rs. 3,68,460/- (Rupees Three Lakhs Sixty Eight Thousand Four Hundred and Sixty only). They have applied for the issue of a duplicate licence (both copies of the licence i.e., Customs Control Copy and Exchange Control Copy) on the ground that the original has been lost/misplaced. It is further stated that the licence was not utilised.

2. In support of this contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Customs and Exchange Control copies of the said licence has been lost. Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-clause 9(cc) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7th December, 1955 as amended, the said original licence No. G/ST/2379276/S/GE/27/H/22/CG II, dated 15th July 1968 issued to The National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Near Industrial Estate, Okhla, New Delhi-20, is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Custom and Exchange Control copies of the said licence is being issued separately to the licensee.

[No. CG. II/NSIC/50/68-69.]

G. S. SHARMA,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports  
for Chief Controller of Imports & Exports

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS

(P. & T. Board)

New Delhi, the 15th October 1968

S.O. 3749.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director-General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specified the 1st December, 1968 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Srigananagar Telephone Exchange, Rajasthan Circle.

[No. 5-65/68-PHB.]

S. P. SRIVASTAVA, Asstt. Director General (PHB).

संचार विभाग

(डाक-तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 15 अक्टूबर 1968

एस० ओ० 3750.—स्थायी आदेश कर संखा 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च 1960 द्वारा लागू किये गए 1951 के भारतीय तार विधमों के नियम 434 के खण्ड III के पेरा (क) के प्रनुसार डाक-तार मंत्रिवेशक ने श्री गंगनगर टेलीफोन केन्द्र में 1-12-68 से प्रभापित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[सं० 5/65/68/पी० एच० बी०]

स० प्र० श्रीवास्तव, सहायक महानिवेशक (पी० एच० बी०)।

**MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING**  
**ORDER**

*New Delhi, the 3rd October 1968*

**S.O. 3751.**—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provisions of the enactments specified in the First Schedule annexed hereto the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Second Schedule annexed hereto in all language versions to be of the description specified against it in column 6 of the said Second Schedule

**THE FIRST SCHEDULE**

- (1) Sub-Section (4) of the Section 12 and Section 16 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (Central Act XXXVII of 1952).
- (2) Sub-Section (3) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Bombay Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Bombay Act XI of 1953).

**THE SECOND SCHEDULE**

Sl. No.	Title of the film	Length 35 mm	Name of the Applicant	Name of the Producer	Whether a Scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news & current events or a docu- mentary film
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Maharashtra News No. 196	268.00 M	Director of Publicity Government of Maharashtra, Bombay.		Film dealing with news and current events (for release in Maharashtra Circuit only).

[No. F. 24/1/67-PF App. 129.]

**S.O. 3752.**—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provisions of each of the enactments specified in the First Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the film specified in column 2 of the Second Schedule annexed hereto in Gujarati to be of the description specified against it in column 6 of the said Second Schedule.

**THE FIRST SCHEDULE**

- (1) Sub-Section of the Section 12 and Section 16 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (Central Act XXXVII of 1952).
- (2) Sub-Section (3) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Bombay Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Bombay Act XVII of 1953).
- (3) Sub-Section (4) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Saurashtra Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Saurashtra Act XVII of 1953).

**THE SECOND SCHEDULE**

Sl. No.	Title of the film	Length 35 mm	Name of the Applicant	Name of the Producer	Whether a Scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news & current events or a documentary film
1	Mahitichitra No. 99.	251.46 M	Director of Information Government of Gujarat, Ahmedabad-15.		Film dealing with news and current events (for release in Gujarat Circuit only).

[No. F.24/1/68-PF App. 1292.]  
BANU RAM AGGARWAL, Under Secy.

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT & REHABILITATION**

**(Department of Labour & Employment)**

*New Dehli, the 14th October 1968*

**S.O. 3753.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Smt. C.D. Souza, Kum. L.D. Patil, Smt. A. B. Sukthankar, Kum. S.G. Korday, Smt. C. Rangaswamy and Shri V.K. Bagadia to be Inspectors for the whole of the State of Maharashtra for the purposes of the said Act and of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of, the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oil-field or a controlled industry.

[No. 20(65)/64-PF, I.]

*New Dehli, the 16th October 1968*

**S.O. 3754.**—Whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the National Coal Development Corporation Limited Press at Ranchi are otherwise in receipt of benefits substantially similar to the benefits provided under the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby exempts the above mentioned press from the operation of the said Act for a period of one year with effect from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

[No. F. 6(15)/67-HI.]

**S.O. 3755.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employers and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Pernasharp Razors Private Ltd., 12 New C.I.T. Road, Calcutta-12 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 30th April, 1968.

[No. 8/138/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 3756.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Murugan Offset Printers, 36 Sattur Road, Sivakasi, Madras State have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall come into force on the Thirtyfirst day of July, 1963.

[No. 8/136/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 3757.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs M. S. Jagannathan and Viswanathan, Chartered Accountants Ganesh Mahal, Divan Bahadur Road, Rathnasabapathipurm, Coimbatore-2 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirtieth day of June, 1968.

[No. 8/134/68/P.F.II.]

**S.O. 3758.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies that, with effect from the 30th April, 1968, section 6 of the said Act shall, in its application to Messrs Pernasharp Razors Private Limited 12 New C.I.T. Road, Calcutta-12, be subject to the modification that for the words 'six and a quarter per cent', the words 'eight per cent' were substituted.

[No. 8(138)/68-PF. II.]

**S.O. 3759.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies that section 6 of the said Act, shall in its application to Engineers India Limited, Allahabad Bank Building (3rd Floor), 17-Parliament Street, New Delhi (including its branches/sub-offices at Bombay and Madras), with effect from the 1st August, 1967, be subject to the modification that for the words "six and a quarter per cent", the words "eight per cent" shall be substituted.

[No. 8/169/67-PF. II.]

**S.O. 3760.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Engineers India Limited, Allahabad Bank Building (3rd Floor), 17-Parliament Street, New Delhi-1 (including its branches/sub-offices at Bombay and Madras), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirtyfirst day of July, 1967.

[No. 8/169/67-PF. II.]

**S.O. 3761.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Republic Forge Company Limited Maula Ali, Secunderabad-17 (Andhra Pradesh) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of August, 1968.

[No. 8/132/68/PF. II.]

**S.O. 3762.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Jumna Employees Cooperative Society Limited No. R. 103 Koratty, Kerala State have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment with effect from the 30th September, 1968.

[No. 8/121/68-PF. II.]

**S.O. 3763.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Pestop Private Ltd., Mysore Road, Bangalore-26 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of July, 1968.

[No. 8/142/68/PF. II.]

**S.O. 3764.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Jai Bharat Enterprises No. 2, Ali Asker Road, Bangalore with Branch at Bunder Street, Mangalore-1 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This Notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 30th day of June, 1968.

[No. 8/143/68/PF.II.]

*New Delhi, the 18th October 1968*

**S.O. 3765.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies that, with effect from the 30th September 1968, section 6 of the said Act shall, in its application to Jumna Employees Cooperative Society Ltd., No. R103, Koratty, Kerala State, be subject to the modification that for the words 'six and a quarter per cent' the words 'eight per cent' were substituted.

[No. 8(121)/68/PF.II.]

**S.O. 3766.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Orissa Concrete Products Limited, Bhubaneswar Road, P.O. Rasulgarh, District Puri (Orissa) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment with effect from the 30th September 1968.

[No. 8/25/68/PF.II.]

**S.O. 3767.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Hind Engineering Works, 372, Dharwar Road, Belgaum (Mysore State) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This Notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of March, 1968.

[No. 8/128/68/PF.II.]

**S.O. 3768.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies that, with effect from the 31st March, 1968, section 6 of the said Act shall in its application to Messrs Hind Engineering Works, 372, Dharwar Road, Belgaum (Mysore State), be subject to the modification that for the words "six and a quarter per cent", the words "eight per cent" were substituted.

[No. 8/128/68/PF.II.]

DALJIT SINGH, Under Secy.

(Dept. of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 15th October 1968

**S.O. 3769.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 83 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby exempts the marble mines in Makarana, District Nagaur, Rajasthan, from all the provisions of the said Act, for a period of one year from the date of issue of this Notification.

[No. 1/29/68-MI.]

J. D. TEWARI, Under Secy.

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 15th October 1968

**S.O. 3770.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Seetalpur Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 9th October, 1968

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA.

REFERENCE NO. 81 OF 1967

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Seetalpur Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited.

AND

Their workmen.

PRESIDENT :

Shri B. N. Banerjee, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

*On behalf of Employers.*—Shri D. Narsingh, Advocate.

*On behalf of Workmen.*—Shri P. K. Sanyal, Advocate.

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mines.

AWARD

By Order No. 6/61/67-LRII dated October 24, 1967, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), referred the following dispute between the employers in relation to the Seetalpur Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication, namely:

“Whether the management of Seetalpur No. 4 Pit Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan, was justified in dismissing the following workmen from the service of the colliery:—

1. Shri Mahendar Gope, Door Mazdoor.
2. Shri Taresh Gope, Timber Mistry.
3. Shri Neturi Gope, Driller.
4. Shri Sukram, Timber Mazdoor.

If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?”

2. Of the workmen above-named, Mahendar Gope is now dead. No relief was claimed on behalf of the deceased workman and I am not concerned with him any more.

3. The circumstances in which the above-named workmen were dismissed, as stated by the employer company, are hereinafter related in brief:

Under Section 28 of the Mines Act, 1952, no person shall be allowed to work in a mine on more than 6 days in any week. The weekly rest day, so far Seetalpur Colliery is concerned, is Sunday. One such Sunday fell on October

16, 1966, The paid holiday, on account of Durga Puja Celebration, fell on October 22, 1966. The 23rd October, 1966 happened to be another Sunday and as such a rest day. 'Mahanavami' of Durga Puja celebration fell on October 21, 1966. Since 'Mahanavami' day is also a festival occasion for Hindus, it was decided, at a meeting of the Pit Committee held on October 3, 1966, that the workers would work on October 16, 1966, which was a Sunday and a rest day, and in lieu thereof October 21, 1966 would be observed as a rest day. The obvious reason, according to the employer company, was that the workers wanted to have a longer spell of holiday for Durga Puja celebration. The resolution of the Pit Committee was sent to the management and the management agreed to the proposal. The Mines department was accordingly informed and the change of rest day was notified in the Notice Board and also circulated amongst the workmen. There was no objection raised to the proposal by the Colliery Mazdoor Union at that stage. Two of the prominent members of the Union, named Mahendar Gope and Taresh Gope, were themselves present, according to the employer company, at the Pit Committee meeting and the resolution was passed in their presence and with their consent.

4. In spite of all this, in the early morning of October 16, 1966, before the opening of the lamp cabin for the first shift, Mahendar Gope, Taresh Gope, Neturi Gope and Sukram, all workmen named in the order of reference, organised a demonstration with about 40 persons and began to shout slogans and protested against keeping the colliery open on a rest day. The workmen were also obstructed by the above-named four persons. Due to the agitation and the obstruction, average attendance in the first shift fell lower by about 152 workmen and there was loss of production of 220 tonnes of coal, as compared to average output.

5. In the aforesaid circumstances, it was alleged by the management, the four workmen were charged with misconduct in the following language:

'In a meeting held on 3rd October, 1966 at 5 P.M., the Pit Committee resolved that the mine should work on Sunday the 16th October, 1966 and the workers should be given Rest Day for the week on Friday, the 21st October, 1966 in lieu of Sunday the 16th. The resolution was fully supported by the Union and was accepted by the Management and the Mines Department was informed accordingly. This Notice was also displayed on the Notice Board.'

On 16th October, 1966 at about 8 A.M. when workers were going to their work peacefully, you along with Sarbashree Mahender Gope, Door Mazdoor, Taresh Gope, Timber Mistri and Sukram, Timber Mazdoor, took violent attitude and physically obstructed them from going to their work. You shouted slogans and due to your riotous and disorderly behaviour either some of them could not go to work in time or could not go at all.

Due to your illegal action, you caused damage to the work in progress.

You are therefore charged under section 27(5) and 27(9) of the Standing Orders.

You are suspended pending enquiry."

The chargesheet bears the date October 18, 1966. To the above chargesheet, the four workmen submitted explanation in identical language, on October 20, 1966. One such explanation is set out below:

"I am extremely sorry for the reason that has compelled you to issue such chargesheet. The resolution taken in the Pit Committee was supported by the Union. But just on the next morning the exciting propaganda of the office bearers of the Colliery Mazdoor Congress have misguided and excited the labour of the colliery and they approached us not to run the colliery on Sunday (i.e. the 16th October, 1966). The grave attitude of the labour regarding the running of the colliery and unnecessary illegal and exciting remarks of the office bearers of the CMC union have compelled us to co-operate with the major portion of the employees of the colliery.

The resolution of the Pit Committee was taken on Monday (3rd October, 1966) and it was displayed in the Notice Board on Friday (14th October, 1966—evening). This sufficient time has encouraged the labours to make sufficient propaganda not to run the colliery and we could not prevent them as we were not sure regarding the fact.

Whether the sanction of running the colliery has come from CIM or not, when notice was displayed in the Notice Board the situation was out of our control and we compelled to join the major portion of the employee.

We were not four in number mentioned in my chargesheet, but also there was a mass. I did not take any violent attitude and did not obstruct any man

physically from going on their duty and I did not shout any slogan, simply I was with the mass.

Again as mentioned in my chargesheet that I was in a state riotous and disorderly behaviour is absolutely false and fabricated. To the best of my knowledge I was in peaceful state.

We had not intention to make any quarrel with the management rather we are ready to give all sorts of cooperation in the administration so that the colliery may run peacefully and smoothly."

6. Mr. Kabi, who is said to be Security Officer of the employer company, was entrusted with the enquiry into the charges. According to the management, the enquiry was held on October 28, October 29 and October 31, 1966. Further, according to the management, the dates of enquiry were notified to the persons charged. On the first day of enquiry, it is said, six persons, on behalf of the management, were examined as witnesses. On the next day, 9 persons, on behalf of the management, were examined and on the last day, 8 persons on behalf of the delinquents were examined as witnesses. On consideration of the evidence, the enquiring officer, submitted a report, by which he found all the four guilty of the charges levelled against them and recommended that they be meted out exemplary punishment. Accepting the recommendation, the management passed order of dismissal on the four workmen above-named.

7. This dismissal raised an industrial dispute which was taken up by the Colliery Mazdoor Union. In the written statement filed on behalf of the workmen by the Colliery Mazdoor Union, it was alleged that the majority of workmen in Seetalpur Colliery were members of the Colliery Mazdoor Union, which began to function in the locality, in the year 1966. This union was not liked by the management, which favoured another trade union known as Colliery Mazdoor Congress. According to the workmen, this latter union had earned notoriety in not acting to the best interest of workmen. It was further alleged in the written statement that Taresh Gope was the Vice-President, Mohendra Gope was the Assistant Secretary, Sukram was a member of the Executive Committee and Neturi was an active member of the Colliery Mazdoor Union. Because of their union activities, they said, they fell in disfavour of the employer company.

8. In paragraphs 6 and 7 of the written statement, it is alleged as follows :

"6. Sunday is the weekly off day for the workmen employed in Seetalpur No. 4 Pit Colliery. The Management of the colliery without any justification whatsoever and against the opposition of the majority of workers proposed to run the colliery on 16th October 1966 which was a Sunday. The management in collusion with Company's sponsored Pit Committee decided to give effect to its proposal of running the colliery on the said 16th October, 1966 (Sunday). The majority workmen having previously expressed their unwillingness to work on 16th October, 1966 did not go for work to the colliery on that date.

7. The management finding that their plan to run the colliery on 16th October, 1966 did not materialise most unjustly and wrongfully issued chargesheets against Sarvashree Mohendra Gope, Taresh Gope, Neturi Gope and Sukram Sarai making baseless and false allegations against the said workmen on 18th October, 1966."

The enquiry which was started on the basis of the chargesheet was characterised, in paragraph 10 of the written statement, as hereinbelow set out:

"10. Accordingly the said workmen attend the enquiries but no proper enquiry had been held. There was only a show of enquiry. The delinquents were not allowed to examine their defence witnesses. The said enquiries were also otherwise vitiated."

Lastly, in paragraph 12 of the written statement, certain general allegations were made against the enquiry to the effect that the enquiry was wholly unjust, unfair, mafafide, illegal and opposed to the principles of natural justice. It was made with ulterior motive and by way of victimisation.

9. Shri P. K. Sanyal, learned Advocate for Colliery Mazdoor Union, made an improvement upon the written statement and argued with great emphasis that there was no enquiry held at all. He examined, before this tribunal, the three persons, namely Taresh Gope, Neturi Gope and Sukram who had been charged for misconduct, in support of his version. The first witness was Taresh Gope. In his examination-in-chief he said :

"I myself used to look after the affairs of the Colliery Mazdoor Union. Because we joined the new union, the company discharged ourselves. In the year

1966, I was a member of the Colliery Mazdoor Union. I do not remember whether any meeting of the pit committee was held on October 3, 1966. We heard that October 16 would be a working day and there was some sort of disturbance on that decision. Workmen began to move about discontently in protest against that decision. I was ready to go to work on the 16th but there was a large force engaged by the company. Out of fear I went away to my quarter. It is untrue that I obstructed anybody. The employers served chargesheet upon me and I gave reply to the chargesheet. I received notice of enquiry. The officer told me, on the date fixed, that the enquiry would be held on next day and asked me to come. I went to the enquiry. When I went to the enquiry I was told by Mr. Kabi that the enquiry would be held on the day following. On the following day I went but Mr. Kabi did not turn up. Thereafter, we were discharged and since then we are sitting idle. We did not apply asking the enquiring officer to hear witnesses on our behalf. We did not also say that we would submit our written statement at the enquiry.”.

In his cross-examination, he denied that he put his signature either on the explanation of the charge or to the application asking for time to file a written statement (Ext. E). He was asked to attempt a signature on piece of paper before this tribunal. He scribbled down something, which did not look like the signature on Ext. E or on the explanation to the charge. Whether he was malingering or whether he was really unable to make a proper signature, I am not sure. The second witness was Neturi Gope. He also admitted that he was a renegade from the Colliery Mazdoor Congress to the Colliery Mazdoor Union and because the Assistant Secretary of the latter union. In his examination in-chief he said :

“When I joined the Mazdoor Union, the company discharged me. I did not get any information that October 16, 1966, Sunday, would not be a rest day but a working day. I did not go to work on October 16, 1966. It is untrue that I obstructed anybody from going to work on that day. The company served a chargesheet upon me. I submitted my replies to the chargesheet. There was no enquiry thereafter.”

He also denied that he put his signature on any documents thereafter.

The third witness examined was Sukram. He admitted his connection with the Colliery Mazdoor Union. In his examination in-chief he said :

“I do not know that on October 16, 1966, which was a Sunday, the company directed us to work in the pit. I did not go to work on the 16th because it was a closed day. On the 18th the employer served a chargesheet on myself and on three others. I submitted my explanation to the charge. I received notice of enquiry into the chargesheet. I went to the enquiry but I was asked to go on the next day. Thereafter, nothing happened to the enquiry.”.

He also denied having put his signature on any document or having asked for examination of witnesses before the domestic enquiry.

10. There was only one witness examined on behalf of the management. He was Biswanath Lala, Assistant Security Officer of the employer company. In his examination in-chief he said :

“I know they were served with chargesheets. I know there was an enquiry into the chargesheets. Mr. Kabi was the enquiring officer. I assisted him. I recorded the statements under the dictation of Mr. Kabi. The depositions were recorded in the presence of the delinquents who were chargesheeted at the dictation of Mr. Kabi. After the statements were recorded, Mr. Kabi explained the recorded statements in Hindi to the witnesses and the witnesses put their signatures on their recorded depositions.”.

He proved the list of witnesses cited by the delinquent workmen (Ext. D) and also the application asking for time to enable them to file a statement in writing. This witness was cross-examined at length by Mr. Sanyal. But he consistently stuck to his version.

11. Now, the position is like this. If after service of the chargesheets and the notice of enquiry on the workmen, no enquiry was held and the workmen were dismissed without enquiry into their misconduct, then the order of dismissal must be set aside. If, on the other hand, there was an enquiry held, I have to ascertain whether that enquiry was held according to the principles of natural justice and whether findings arrived at were based on evidence and were not perverse or wayward. If the domestic enquiry passes the above test, then I have to remind myself that am not sitting in appeal over the domestic enquiry and cannot substitute my own finding in place of the finding of the enquiring officer based on evidence.

12. Mr. D. Narsingh, learned advocate for the employer company, submitted that the workmen should not be believed. He argued that neither in paragraph 10 nor in paragraph 12 of the written statement, which I have already set out, there was any case made to the effect that there had been no enquiry at all held. All that was stated was that there was no proper enquiry or that there was a show of enquiry and that the order of dismissal was unjust and made by way of victimisation. There is some force in this branch of argument. It was nowhere pleaded that there was no enquiry held, no witnesses were examined in the presence of the workmen and no invitation was given to them to examine their own witnesses. Mr. Narsingh is right in his submission that the pleading falls short of the argument which Mr. Sanyal wanted to make before this tribunal.

13. Mr. Narsingh further submitted that Taresh Gope was himself a member of the pit committee, as he himself admitted, yet then he said that he did not remember whether there was a meeting of the pit committee held on October 3, 1966. He invited my attention to page 7 of Ext. A (proceedings of the pit committee meeting) which showed that Taresh Gope was present at the meeting. Also present at the meeting was Mahendar Gope. Yet then, Taresh Gope said that he had only heard that October 16 would be working day. He submitted that the delinquent witnesses came fore-sworn to deny everything and they should not be believed. In my opinion, there is also substance in this contention. That there was a pit committee meeting is admitted; that there was a resolution passed in that meeting declaring October 16, 1966 as a working day and October 23, 1966 as a rest day in lieu thereof admits of no dispute; that the pit committee resolution was duly publicised appears from the explanations of the workmen to the show cause notice themselves. In this background, for Taresh to say that he heard that 16th would be a working day and for Neturi and Sukram to say that they did not know that October 16 was a working day do not appear to be truthful speaking.

14. Mr. Narsingh also argued that to say that the company decided to victimise the four workmen, named in the order of reference, for their union activities is not to speak realistically. Even if those workmen were penalised for union activities, there would always be others who would take their place. He invited my attention to the evidence of workman Sukram, who admitted that there were about 1000 workmen, who were members of the disfavoured union. I also find substance in this argument. Unless union activity, with which all the employers have now to reconcile themselves, was intolerable, so far as the employer company was concerned, I am unable to go to the length of believing that the employer company got so very annoyed with the four workmen for their union activities that they went to the length of trumping up a false charge against them and then forging entire enquiry proceedings against them in order to dismiss them. If it was necessary for them to find fault with the above mentioned workmen, on trumped up charges, they could certainly find obliging witnesses deposing against them and believe in such witnesses, in an open door enquiry. It would not have been necessary for them to forge the entire materials of the proceedings against the workmen as was urged by Mr. Sanyal.

15. Mr. Sanyal tried to establish his contention that the entire record of enquiry proceedings was forged on the following lines of reasoning. He submitted that there was no prosecutor present at the enquiry. Mr. Lala also could not say who were calling the witnesses on behalf of the management. According to Mr. Sanyal this was an unheard of procedure and should be disbelieved. He next contended that the list of defence witnesses (Ext. D at page 45), which was produced by the employer was a curious document. It did not appear who filed that document. Mr. Lala in his cross-examination stated that the document was signed by the delinquents in his presence. Thereafter, it mattered little by whose hand the document was filed before the enquiring officer. Mr. Sanyal criticised that if the persons, said to be defence witnesses, were at all cited by the defence, it did not appear who declined their cross-examination. This was explained by Mr. Lala in the following language :

"The other delinquent namely other than the person who was putting questions to him declined to put further questions, therefore the note 'cross-examination declined' was made."

In my opinion this is good enough explanation.

16. Apart from the superficial criticisms as indicated above, Mr. Sanyal did not argue that if the enquiry had been really held then the proceedings were vitiated by violation of his principles of natural justice or that on the evidence the findings were perverse. His singular line of attack was that there was no enquiry held and that the entire proceedings of enquiry were fabricated documents. On the uncorroborated testimony of the three delinquent persons, I am not prepared to go to that length. Their evidence did not inspire confidence and I am not prepared, on their evidence, to say that the management went to the length of levelling false charge against the workmen and then condemn them without the documentary evidence.

17. The view that I take, I hold that the dismissal of the workmen named in the order of reference was justified and that they are not entitled to any relief. I award accordingly.

Sd/- B. N. BANERJEE, Presiding Officer.

Dated, September 20, 1968.

[No. 6/61/67-LRII.]

*New Delhi, the 16th October 1968*

**S.O. 3771.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of Shri K. Sharan, Arbitrator, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the West Gopalichack Colliery of Messrs Central Kirkend Coal Company Limited, Post Office Kusunda, District Dhanbad, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th October, 1968.

BEFORE SHRI K. SHARAN, REGIONAL LABOUR COMMISSIONER (C)  
ASANSOL  
AND  
ARBITRATOR

PRESENT :

Shri K. Sharan, Regional Labour Commissioner (C), Asansol & Arbitrator.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to :

West Gopalichack Colliery of M/s. Central Kirkend Coal Company Ltd., P.O. Kusunda, Dist. Dhanbad.

*Vrs.*

Their workmen represented through Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, Dhanbad.

APPEARANCES :

*For the employer :*

(1) Shri G. C. Mukherjee, Manager, West Gopalichack Colliery, M/s. Central Kirkend Coal Company Ltd, P.O. Kusunda, Dist. Dhanbad.

*For workmen :*

(1) Shri Lalit Burman, General Secretary, Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, P.O. & Dist, Dhanbad.

(2) Shri Nageswar Singh, Ex-Guard, West Gopalichack Colliery.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine

DISTRICT : Dhanbad (Bihar).

No. E-1/2(3)/68

*Asansol, the 19th September, 1968*

#### AWARD

The Central Government, having received on the 1st April, 1968, a written agreement dated 29th March, 1968 between the employers in relation to West Gopalichack Colliery of M/s. Central Kirkend Coal Company Ltd., P. O. Kusunda, Dist. Dhanbad (hereinafter referred to as the said management) and their workmen represented by the Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, P. O. and Dist. Dhanbad hereinafter referred to as the said union) in pursuance of the provision of sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) referring the industrial dispute between them, the specific matters in dispute being as detailed below to my arbitration and the Central Government being of the opinion that the industrial dispute referred to above existed between the said management and their workmen, ordered publication of the said arbitration agreement in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) under its order No. 2/52/67-LRII dated the 5th April, 1968;

#### Specific Matters in Dispute :

"Whether the management of West Gopalichack Colliery of Messrs Central Kirkend Coal Company Limited, Post Office Kusunda, District Dhanbad was justified in dismissing from service Shri Nageswar Singh, Guard with effect from 13th December, 1966 ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?"

2. The General Secretary, Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha submitted to me a written statement dated 22nd May, 1968 on behalf of the workmen and Shri S. C. Jain, Director M/s. Central Kirkend Coal Co. Ltd., submitted to me rejoinder dated 4th June, 1968 on behalf of the management. I fixed hearing on 25th June, 1968, but on the request of the said union the hearing was adjourned to 5th July, 1968 which was further adjourned to 19th July, 1968 and again to 26th August, 1968 on the request of the said management. On the 26th August, 1968, Shri G. C. Mukherjee, Manager, West Gopalichack Colliery of M/s. Central Kirkend Coal Co. Ltd., was present on behalf of the said management and Shri Lalit Burman, General Secretary of the said union was present on behalf of the workmen. On that date the parties entered into an agreement in my present wherein they agreed that I might give my award in the dispute on question latest by 30th September, 1968. A copy of the agreement dated 26th August, 1968 is enclosed *vide Annexure I*. Subsequently, both the parties requested for a short adjournment in order to enable them to have bilateral negotiation with a view to bringing about an amicable settlement. Accordingly, I adjourned the hearing to be held in my office on the 18th September, 1968.

3. On 18th September, 1968 Shri G. C. Mukherjee, Manager, West Gopalichack Colliery of M/s. Central Kirkend Coal Co. Ltd., was present on behalf of the said management and Shri Lalit Burman, General Secretary of the said union and Shri Nageshwar Singh, workman directly concerned in the dispute were present on behalf of the workmen. The parties filed a joint petition of compromise dated 18th September, 1968 requesting therein that I might accept the terms of settlement incorporated in the joint petition of compromise referred to above and pass my award accordingly. According to the terms of the settlement, the said management, agreed to pay a sum of Rs. 900/- (Rupees nine hundred) only to Shri Nageshwar Singh, Guard, the workman directly concerned in the dispute, in full final settlement of his claim for reinstatement and also to pay him all his outstanding legal dues, if any, as soon as possible but in any case not later than the 31st October, 1968 and Shri Nageshwar Singh, the workman directly concerned in the dispute agreed to accept the payments referred to above in full and final settlement of his claim. The joint petition of compromise referred to above was duly verified and brought on record. The terms of settlement incorporated in the joint petition of compromise appear to me to be fair, reasonable and in the interest of the workman concerned and as such I accept them. Accordingly, I make my arbitration award in terms of the joint petition of compromise in question and submit it to the Central Government under Section 10A of the I.D. Act, 1947. The joint petition of compromise in question is annexed hereto *vide Annexure II* and made part of the award.

(Sd.) K. SHARAN,  
Regional Labour Commissioner (C),  
Asansol,  
&  
Arbitrator.

ANNEXURE I

BEFORE SHRI K. SHARAN, REGIONAL LABOUR COMMISSIONER (C),  
ASANSOL

AND  
ARBITRATOR

In the matter of an industrial dispute between the management of West Gopalichack Colliery of M/s. Central Kirkend Coal Co. Ltd, P.O. Kusunda, Dhanbad and their workmen represented by the Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, Dhanbad over dismissal of Shri Nageshwar Singh, Guard with effect from 13th December, 1966 and in the matter of an arbitration agreement dated 29th March, 1968 under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 in form 'C'.

Employers in relation to West Gopalichack Colliery, of M/s. Central Kirkend Coal Co. Ltd, P.O. Kusunda, Dist. Dhanbad.

*Vrs.*

Their workmen represented by the Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, Dhanbad.

PRESENT :

Shri K. Sharan, Regional Labour Commissioner (C), Asansol and Arbitrator.

Representing employer :

Shri G. C. Mukherjee, Manager, West Gopalichack Colliery, P.O. Kusunda, Dist. Dhanbad.

Representing the workmen :

Shri Lalit Burman, General Secretary, Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, Dhanbad.

It is agreed between the parties that Shri K. Sharan, Regional Labour Commissioner (C), Asansol and Arbitrator may give his award in the dispute referred to above latest by 30th September, 1968.

*Representing the manager:*

*Representing the workmen:*

(Sd.) Illegible

K. SHARAN,

Regional Labour Commissioner (C),  
Asansol,  
&  
Arbitrator.

Asansol, the 26th August, 1968.

ANNEXURE II

BEFORE SHRI K. SHARAN, REGIONAL LABOUR  
COMMISSIONER (CENTRAL), ASANSOL,

AND  
ARBITRATOR

In the matter of arbitration in the industrial dispute between the management of West Gopalichack Colliery of M/s. Central Kirkend Coal Company Limited and their workmen represented by Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, Dhanbad over alleged wrongful termination of services of Shri Nageswar Singh, Guard.

PARTIES :

- (1) Shri G. C. Mukherjee, Manager, West Gopalichack Colliery, M/s. Central Kirkend Coal Company Ltd, P.O. Kusunda, Dhanbad.
- (2) Shri Lalit Burman, General Secretary, Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, Dhanbad.

*Joint Petition of Compromise*

The parties abovenamed beg to submit that the above dispute has been mutually settled on the following terms:—

*Terms of Settlement*

1. (i) That the management of West Gopalichack Colliery of M/s. Central Kirkend Coal Company Limited, P.O. Kusunda, Dist. Dhanbad (hereinafter referred to as management) agrees to pay the sum of Rs. 900/- (Rupees nine hundred) only to Shri Nageswar Singh, the workman concerned in the present dispute in full and final settlement of his claim for reinstatement.

(ii) That the management agrees to pay him all his outstanding legal dues, if any.

2. Shri Nageswar Singh, Guard agrees to accept the above payments in full and final settlement of his claim.

3. The payment under term No. 1 above shall be made as soon as possible but in no case later than the 31st October, 1968.

The parties submit that the Arbitrator may be pleased to accept the above mentioned terms of settlement and pass an award accordingly.

*Representing employer:*

Sd/- G. C. MUKHERJEE,

18-9-68

Manager, West Gopalichack  
Colliery, M/s. Central  
Kirkend Coal Company Ltd,  
P.O. Kusunda, Dist. Dhanbad.

*Representing workman:*

Sd/- LALIT BURMAN,

18-9-68

General Secretary,  
Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha,  
Dhanbad.

Sd/- NAGESWAR SINGH, GUARD  
Workman concerned, 18-9-68.

*Witnesses:*

1. Sd/- R. B. MAZUMDER, 18-9-68.

2. Sd/- B. S. SACHDEV, 18-9-68.

Asansol, the 18th September, 1968.

New Delhi, the 17th October 1968

**S.O. 3772.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Godhar Colliery of Messrs Godhar Colliery Company, Post Office, Kusunda, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th October, 1968.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD**

**PRESENT:**

Shri Nandagiri Venkata Rao, Presiding Officer.

**REFERENCE No. 124 OF 1967**

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to the Godhar Colliery of Messrs Godhar Colliery Company, Post office, Kusunda, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen.

**APPEARANCES:**

*For the employers:* Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Executive Committee Member, Indian Colliery Owners Association.

*For the workmen:* Shri Ram Mitra, Secretary, Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha.

**STATE:** Bihar.

**INDUSTRY:** Coal.

**AWARD**

The Central Government, being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Godhar Colliery of Messrs Godhar Colliery Company, Post office Kusunda, District Dhanbad and their workmen, by its order No. 2/32/66-LRII dated 18th March, 1966 referred to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication the dispute in respect of the matters specified in the schedule annexed thereto. The schedule is extracted below:

**SCHEDULE**

“Whether the management of the Godhar Colliery of Messrs Godhar Colliery Company was justified in not allowing Shri Lachhman Sonar, Mechanical Fitter, to resume duty with effect from the 25th May 1965? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. The Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad registered the reference as reference No. 54 of 1966 on its file. Employers filed their statement of demands. While it was pending before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, the proceeding was transferred to this Tribunal by the Central Government by its order No. 8/23/67-LRII dated 8th May, 1967. Consequently, the reference is renumbered on the file of this Tribunal as reference No. 124 of 1967. Workmen filed their statement of demands.

3. Shri Lachhman Sonar (hereinafter referred to as the affected workman) was a Mechanical Fitter in the colliery of the employers. Owing to his illness the employers sent him to the hospital on 7th May, 1965 for necessary treatment. The hospital authorities discharged him on 14th May, 1965. These facts are not controverted. The case of the workmen is that the affected workman, while being discharged from the hospital on 14th May, 1965 was recommended 10 days rest, that he went to the colliery and reported the fact to the Medical Officer and submitted the discharge certificate to him on 14th May, 1965 itself and that after the expiry of 10 days rest period he reported for duty on 25th May, 1965. But the employers refused to allow him to join duty without any reason whatsoever, that he personally met the Manager of the colliery for duty but the Manager, instead of allowing him to join duty asked him to submit his resignation, that he consistently reported for duty and presented himself before the various authorities with no result, that he sent a petition dated 23rd October, 1965 under registered post to the Manager of the colliery explaining his case, that the management refused to accept the letter, that the management issued a charge-sheet dated 3rd November, 1965 to him, that he submitted his reply denying the charge, that the management did not hold a prior enquiry that

the findings of the Enquiry Officer were perverse and violated the principles of natural justice and that his dismissal through the letter dated 6th December, 1965 was unjustified. According to the employers, after the affected workman was discharged from the hospital nothing was heard from him and he remained absent without any information or authorised leave for more than six months, that a charge-sheet dated 3rd November, 1965 for absenting without information or authorised leave was issued to him, that he submitted his explanation, that a departmental enquiry was held on 22nd November, 1965 and 29th November, 1965 wherein he was given full opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses and defend himself and that in the departmental enquiry the misconduct mentioned in the charge-sheet was satisfactorily established and, consequently, the affected workman was dismissed by the letter dated 6th December, 1965. The employers emphatically denied that the affected workman was not allowed to resume duty with effect from 25th May, 1965. In the rejoinder filed by them the employers denied that they had refused to receive the letter dated 23rd October, 1965 from the affected workman. They also took an objection that the dispute involved in the reference was not an industrial dispute. The workmen were represented by Shri Ram Mitra, Secretary, Bihar Koyal Mazdoor Sabha and the employers by Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Executive Committee Member, Indian Colliery Owners Association. By consent of the workmen, Exts. M1 and M2 were marked for the employers and by consent of the employers Exts. W1 and W2 for the workmen. On behalf of the workmen the affected workman was examined as WW1 and Exts. W3 and W4 were marked. On behalf of the employers also a witness was examined and Exts. M3 and M4 were marked. Shri S. S. Mukherjee, the learned representative of the employers has given up the objection that the dispute involved in the reference is not an industrial dispute.

4. The only question for determination is whether the affected workman was discharged from the hospital with a recommendation for 10 days rest, reported for duty at the colliery on 25th May, 1965 and the management refused to allow him to join duty. In this respect there is the sole testimony of the affected workman himself, WW1. There is no further evidence, documentary or oral to corroborate him. Exts. W1, W2 and W4 are letters stated to have been sent on his behalf. Ext. W3 is a testimonial dated 6th December, 1956 which has no bearing on the question under consideration. As spoken to by him, WW1, it is the case of the affected workman that when he was discharged from the hospital the Doctor gave him a certificate, that he produced the certificate before the Manager, that the Manager told him that he (the affected workman) required 10 days rest and that, accordingly he approached the Manager again on 25th May, 1965. But according to paras 4 and 5 of the statement of the workmen, the affected workman had submitted the discharge certificate recommending him 10 days rest to the Medical Officer, that after expiry of 10 days rest period he reported for duty on 25th May, 1965 but the management refused to allow him to join duty and that after this he personally met the Manager who asked him to submit his resignation. In his explanation to the charge-sheet, Ext. M1 there is absolutely no mention of his approaching the Manager on 14th May, 1965 or the Manager telling him that he required 10 days rest. Further, according to the oral testimony of WW1, the affected workman went to the colliery on 14th May, 1965 and again only on 25th May, 1965. But in his explanation to the charge-sheet, Ext. M1 he had stated that from the time of his discharge from the hospital he was reporting for duty continuously. In the explanation there is absolutely no mention of the Manager asking him to submit his resignation. Ext. W1 is an office copy of a letter addressed to the Manager of the colliery and it is dated 29th May, 1965. There is no mention of it in the statement of the workmen nor in a subsequent letter, Ext. W2. In the failure report of the Conciliation Officer (Central) and its enclosures also there is no mention of Ext. W1. The enquiry into the charge-sheet, Ext. M1 was conducted by MW1 and the enquiry proceedings are Ext. M3. Admittedly, the affected workmen participated in the enquiry. The enquiry proceedings show that the Manager, Time Keeper, the Doctor of the colliery, Leave Clerk, Steno-typist, Engineer and the Labour Welfare Officer were examined and all but 4 were cross-examined by the affected workman. The statement of the affected workman was also recorded. The Manager had denied that the affected workman had approached him at any time or that he was not allowed to resume work. He also denied that he had ever asked him to submit his resignation. The other witnesses denied that they ever saw the affected workman anywhere in the colliery after he was sent to the hospital on 7th May, 1965. On this material it is not possible to hold that the affected workman had appeared for duty on 25th May, 1965 and the employers did not allow him to do so. When the affected workman did not appear at all for duty on 25th May, 1965 no question arises of the employers refusing him work or justification therefor. No question of relief to the affected workman also arises. Thus, the reference is held against the workmen. The award is made accordingly and submitted under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd.) N. VENKATA RAO,  
Presiding Officer,  
Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal (No. 2),  
Dhanbad.  
[No. 2/32/66-LRII.]

**S.O. 3773.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Hirakun Colliery, Post Office Neturia, District Purulia and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th October, 1968.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA**

**REFERENCE NO. 84 OF 1967**

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to the Hirakun Colliery,

AND

Their workmen.

**PRESENT:**

Shri B. N. Banerjee—*Presiding Officer.*

**APPEARANCES:**

Shri B. K. Lath, *Advocate—On behalf of Employers.*

Shri K. C. Mitra, *Advocate—On behalf of Workmen.*

**AWARD**

**STATE:** West Bengal.

**INDUSTRY:** Coal Mines.

By Order No. 6/72/67-LRII dated November 3, 1967, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), referred the following dispute between the employers in relation to the Hirakun Colliery and their workmen, for adjudication, to this tribunal, namely:

"Whether the action of the management of Hirakun Colliery in ordering on the 21st July, 1967 the transfer of Shri Shiba Prasad Gantait, Tub-Checker to Central Tasra Colliery and in subsequently terminating his services with effect from the 10th August, 1967, was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. When the matter came up for hearing the workman, the Colliery Mazdoor Union and the employer company arrived at a settlement on the following terms and conditions:

- (i) It is hereby agreed between the parties that Shri Shiba Prasad Gantait shall join his duties at Central Tasra colliery or any other concern of the employer to be selected by the workman within 7 days from the date of publication of the award or on 7th October, 1968 whichever is earlier on the same terms and conditions of service. If the workman fails to join he loses all his rights to employment.
- (ii) That the management agrees to withdraw its order of termination dated 10th August, 1967 and grants him his continuity of service at Central Tasra Colliery or any other concern of the employer. His period of absence shall be treated as leave without pay.
- (iii) That the management agrees to give Rs. 1,000/- (Rupees one thousand only) to the workman in full and final satisfaction of all his claim whatsoever on 21st September, 1968 before the A.L.C. (C), Asansol and the workman shall grant receipt to the management."

The parties to the dispute prayed that the reference should be disposed of on the aforesaid terms and conditions. In token, they put down the aforesaid terms and conditions in a petition of compromise signed by the employer, the employee concerned, their respective advocates and the representative of the union. Now that the dispute between the parties has been settled in terms of compromise, I make an award in terms set out above.

Let the petition of compromise be kept on record.

(Sd.) B. N. BANERJEE,

I

Presiding Officer.

[No. 6/72/67-LRII.]

**S.O. 3774.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Ranipur Colliery of Messrs Equitable Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th October, 1968.

## CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA.

REFERENCE NO. 28 OF 1968

## PARTIES

Employers in relation to the Ranipur Colliery of M/s. Equitable Coal Company Limited,

AND

Their workmen.

## PRESENT :

Shri B. N. Banerjee—*Presiding Officer.*

## APPEARANCES :

*On behalf of Employers*—Shri S. K. Bhattacharya, Labour Adviser.

*On behalf of Workmen*—Shri Nikhilesh Das, Advocate.

## AWARD

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Coal Mines.

By Order No. 6/34/68-LRII dated May 22, 1968, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), referred the following dispute between the employers in relation to the Ranipur Colliery of Messrs Equitable Coal Company Limited and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication, namely :

"Whether the management of Ranipur Colliery of Messrs Equitable Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan are justified in refusing employment to Shri Lalmohan Mukherjee, Explosive Carrier, with effect from the 8th January, 1968, on being declared medically fit. If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. The employer company was represented before me this day by Shri S. K. Bhattacharya, Labour Adviser. The Colliery Mazdoor Congress was represented before me today by Shri Nikhilesh Das, Advocate. The dispute between the parties has been settled amicably and in token of the settlement a petition of compromise signed by General Secretary of the Colliery Mazdoor Congress and the Labour Adviser of the employer company, M/s. Equitable Coal Company Limited, has been filed before me. In my opinion, the settlement is lawful and fully and completely covers the dispute between the parties. I make an award in terms of the settlement and dispose of the reference accordingly. Let the petition of Compromise form part of this award.

Sd/- B. N. BANERJEE,  
Presiding Officer.

September 13, 1968.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA-1.

REFERENCE NO. 28 OF 1968

## PARTIES :

Employers in relation to Ranipur Colliery of Equitable Coal Company Limited,

AND

Their Workmen.

The parties jointly beg to submit that the dispute with which the above Reference is concerned has been amicably settled on the following terms:—

1. That Sri Lal Mohan Mukherjee has been allowed to resume duty as an Explosive Carrier at Ranipur Colliery with effect from 29th April, 1968 prior to the date of reference of this dispute.

2. That period of unemployment of Sri Mukherjee will be treated as leave without pay.
3. That the parties shall bear their own cost.

In the circumstances the parties pray that an Award may kindly be passed by the Hon'ble Tribunal in terms of the above settlement.

*For the workmen*

JAGADISH PANDAY,  
General Secretary,  
Colliery Mazdoor Congress,  
Gorai Mansion,  
Asansol.

*Dated 7th September, 1968.*

*For the Employers*

S. K. BHATTACHARYA,  
Labour Adviser & Constituted  
Attorney of Equitable Coal  
Co., Ltd., P.O. Dishergarh,  
Distt. Burdwan.

[No. 6/34/68-LRII.]

**S.O. 3775.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhanora Colliery of Messrs Equitable Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th October, 1968.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA**

REFERENCE NO. 89 OF 1967

**PARTIES :**

Employers in relation to the management of Bhanora Colliery of M/s. Equitable Coal Company Ltd.,

AND

Their workmen.

**PRESENT :**

Shri B. N. Banerjee—*Presiding Officer.*

**APPEARANCES :**

*On behalf of Employers*—Shri S. K. Bhattacharya, Labour Adviser.

*On behalf of Workmen*—Absent.

**STATE :** West Bengal

**INDUSTRY :** Coal Mines

**AWARD**

By Order No. 2/112/67-LRII dated November 9, 1967, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), referred the following dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhanora Colliery of Messrs Equitable Coal Company Limited and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication, namely:

"(1) Whether M/s. Equitable Coal Company Limited, P.O. Dishergarh, Distt. Burdwan or Shri Sahadat Hossin are/is responsible for the employment in respect of Sarvashri Bhagoo, Ram Asray and Prem, Stone Cutters of Bhanora Colliery ?

(2) Whether the aforesaid Company/Contractor was justified in stopping the 3 Stone Cutters from work with effect from the 19th July, 1967; If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

2. Shri S. K. Bhattacharya, Labour Adviser, appears before me to-day on behalf of the employer company and states that the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled and in proof thereof produces a petition of compromise signed on behalf of the employees Union and the employer. The compromise petition was proved by Shri S. Banerjee, an employee of Equitable Coal Company Limited, who deposed before me on solemn affirmation. Now that the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled, no dispute exists. I record the settlement and make an award in terms thereof. Let the petition of compromise form part of the award.

Sd/- B. N. BANERJEE,  
Presiding Officer.

*September, 13 1968.*

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL.

REFERENCE NO. 89 OF 1967

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to Bhanora Colliery of Equitable Coal Company Limited.

AND

Their Workmen.

The parties jointly beg to submit that the dispute with which the above Reference is concerned has been amicably settled on the following terms:—

1. That Sarvasree Bhagoo and Prem have been appointed as Underground Loaders and Sri Ramasray as Explosive Carrier at Bhanora Colliery by the Employers as their own workmen with effect from 20th August, 1968 on permanent basis.
2. That the Employers shall pay an *ex-gratia* amount of Rs. 200.00 each to Sarvasree Bhagoo, Prem and Ramasray within 15 days from the date of filing this application.
3. That the parties shall bear their own cost.

In the circumstances the parties pray that an Award may kindly be passed by the Hon'ble Tribunal in terms of the above settlement.

*For the workmen*

JAYANTA PODDER

Joint Secretary.

*For the Employers*

S. K. BHATTACHARYA.

Labour Adviser and Constituted Attorney of Equitable Coal Co. Ltd.  
P.O. Dishergarh, Distt. Burdwan.

D. V. RANDIVE,

Organising Secretary,  
Colliery Mazdoor Congress (HME),  
Bengal Hotel,  
Asansol.

*Dated 9th September, 1968.*

[No. 2/112/67-LRIL.]

**S.O. 3776.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act, from Shrimati Sukri Orangin, wife of Shri Durga Orang, Ash Cleaner/Shale picker, represented by Shri S. V. Achario, General Secretary, Hindustan Khan Mazdoor Sangh, Head Office Murulidih, Post Office Moheda, District Dhanbad, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th October, 1968.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 2)  
DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri Nandagiri Venkata Rao, Presiding Officer.

COMPLAINT NO. 5 OF 1968

In the matter of a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

PARTIES:

Shrimati Sukri Orangin w/o Shri Durga Orang, Ash cleaner/Shale-picker, Balihari colliery of Messrs Balihari colliery Co. (P) Ltd., P.O. Kusunda, Dhanbad—*Complainant.*

Employers in relation to Balihari colliery of Messrs Balihari colliery Co. (P) Ltd., P.O. Kusunda, Dhanbad.—*Opp. Party.*

APPEARANCES:

*On behalf of the complainant:*—Shri S. V. Acharior, General Secretary, Hindustan Khan Mazdoor Sangh,

*On behalf of the Opp. Party:*—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Executive Committee Member, Indian Colliery Owners Association.

STATE:—Bihar.

INDUSTRY:—Coal.

Dhanbad, 24th September, 1968

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, by Shrimati Sukri Orangin w/o Shri Durga Orang, Ash cleaner/Shale-picker, Balihari colliery of Messrs Balihari Colliery Co. (P) Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as the opposite party). The undisputed facts giving rise to the complaint are these: An industrial dispute regarding retrenchment of 376 workmen of the opposite party was pending adjudication on the file of this Tribunal as reference No. 148 of 1967, the reference is since transferred to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 3), Dhanbad under Section 33 B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the order of the Central Government No. 8/71/68-LRII dated 12th August, 1968). While the reference was pending before this Tribunal the opposite party found the complainant weak and infirm on account of her old age and unable to discharge her normal duties satisfactorily and issued a letter dated 30th November, 1967 asking the complainant to appear for medical examination at the opposite party's cost on 6th December, 1967 before the Medical Board to check up the physical fitness of the complainant. The complainant sent a letter dated 2nd December, 1967 to the opposite party denying that she was weak and infirm or unable to discharge her normal duties and apprehending that under the cover of medical examination the management of the opposite party intended to victimise her for her association with the Hindustan Khan Mazdoor Sangh and for her refusal to join the pocket union of the opposite party. As the complainant did not appear before the Medical Board on the directed date the opposite party issued a letter dated 15th December, 1967 discharging the complainant from service with effect from 25th December, 1967.

2. Now the case of the complainant is that the complainant is one of the 376 workmen concerned in the reference. The dispute involved in the reference was sponsored by the Hindustan Khan Mazdoor Sangh. The same Sangh is representing the complainant in the present complaint. The opposite party is pampering a pocket union through coercion and intimidation of workmen. The complainant having refused to become a member of the pocket union, the management of the opposite party has victimised her by discharge on the false plea of being old and infirm. The certified Standing Orders of the opposite party do not provide any age limit for retrenchment of the workmen nor do they give any power to the opposite party to call upon any workman to submit to any medical examination. The action of the opposite party in discharging the complainant without giving her any opportunity to defend herself was illegal. The opposite party contravened the provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 in victimising the complainant. The opposite party filed their statement pleading that the complainant was not maintainable as the complainant was not a workman concerned in the reference. They justified the action by them against the complainant on the ground that they were within their right to get its employees examined by a Board of Medical Officers and discharging the complainant when she did not appear before the Medical Board as directed by them. The opposite party denied that they had contravened the provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act or that the action taken by them was with a view to victimise the complainant. The complainant was represented by Shri S. V. Acharior, General Secretary, Hindustan Khan Mazdoor Sangh and the opposite party by Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Executive Committee Member, Indian Colliery Owners Association. On admission by parties Exts. W1 to W3 were marked for the complainant and Exts. M1 to M3 for the opposite party. No witness was examined by any party.

3. In the written statement filed by them the opposite party had pleaded that the complainant was not a "workman concerned in such dispute" within the meaning of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. But Shri S. S. Mukherjee, the learned representative of the opposite party has conceded that the complainant was one of the 376 workmen mentioned in the schedule to the reference. This admission is further supported by the fact that in para 1 of the complaint it was categorically stated "that an industrial dispute regarding retrenchment of the petitioner and 376 other workmen of the Balihari Colliery of M/s. Balihari Colliery Co. (P) Ltd., P.O. Kusunda, Dhanbad is pending adjudication in reference No. 148 of 1967 before this Tribunal". In para

2 of their statement the opposite party has stated "that the statements in paragraph 1 are substantially correct. Therefore it follows that the complainant being one of the 376 workmen directly involved in the reference is admitted by the opposite party. The contention of Shri Mukherjee is that after the reference was made to the Tribunal the opposite party had withdrawn their retrenchment order in respect of 124 workmen, inclusive of the complainant and as such the complainant was no more within the meaning of the phrase "workmen concerned in such dispute" No order is placed on the record to show whether the plea of the opposite party in the reference that they had withdrawn the retrenchment order in respect of the complainant and others was accepted by the Tribunal. I am not shown any authority to support the proposition that if the employers withdraw their retrenchment or any other punishment order against an employee while the reference concerning his dispute is pending, he cannot be any more treated as a "workman concerned in such dispute" within the meaning of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In this view I cannot agree that the complainant is not a "workman concerned in such dispute" within the meaning of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. When the complainant is a "workman concerned in such dispute" the opposite party cannot discharge or punish her for any misconduct connected or not connected with the dispute involved in the reference without complying with the provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The opposite party has brought no material on record to show that they had complied with such provisions before discharging the complainant. In these circumstances the discharge of the complainant by the opposite party cannot sustain.

4. Even otherwise also, I do not find any justification on the part of the opposite party in discharging the complainant from service in the admitted circumstances. Firstly, there is no provision whatsoever in the Certified Standing Orders, Ext. W.1 authorising the opposite party to issue an order to any employee to appear before a medical board to ascertain if he/she is fit for discharging his/her normal duties. Even if it is supposed to be a lawful or reasonable order, disobedience thereof is a misconduct within the meaning of order 29 of the Certified Standing Orders, Ext. W.1, and, according to order 30 thereof the complainant could not be punished for it without a domestic enquiry, being held. It is argued for the opposite party that the order of discharge passed against the complainant was not a punishment for her misconduct but it was an order of termination simpliciter. It is not the case of the opposite party that the complainant was a temporary employee and as such order 24 of the Certified Standing Orders could not be invoked. As per order 22 of the Certified Standing Orders it is mandatory for termination of employees that a notice should be given in writing—one month's notice for monthly paid staff and one week's notice for weekly paid employees. Ext. M3 is the order dated 15th December, 1967 issued by the opposite party discharging the complainant from service with effect from 25th December, 1967. This letter cannot be construed as a notice contemplated under order 22 of the Certified Standing Orders, because the order of discharge was not passed after expiry of the notice period. No wages for the notice period were offered in the order, Ext. M3. Further Ext. M3 clearly shows that the complainant was discharged from service because she had refused to appear before the Medical Board, which is a misconduct for which she could not be punished without holding a departmental enquiry. For these reasons also I find that the action taken by the opposite party cannot be upheld.

5. The complaint petition is, therefore, allowed and the order of discharge passed against the complainant by the opposite party on 15th December 1967 is set aside. The award is made accordingly and submitted under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd). N. VENKATA RAO,  
Presiding Officer.

Central Government Industrial Tribunal,  
(No. 2) at Dhanbad.  
[No. 2/73/66-LRIL]

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 16th October 1968

S.O. 3777.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Khas Jeenagora Colliery, Post Office Khas Jeenagora, iDstrict Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Khas Jeenagora Colliery, Post Office Jeenagora, District Dhanbad, was justified in retrenching the following 85 workmen with effect from the 18th December, 1967?

1. Shri B. B. Singh, P.O.
2. Shri M. L. Nunia, Engineer.
3. Shri S. K. Singh, L.W.O.
4. Shri B. N. Mehata, Surveyor.
5. Shri B. K. Sural, Typist.
6. Shri D. Pandey, Despatch Clerk.
7. Shri A. S. Mehta, Incharge.
8. Shri B. C. Ghosh, Overman.
9. Shri C. D. Bhattacherjee, Overman.
10. Shri B. N. Ghosal, Mining Sirdar.
11. Shri Damru Singh, Mining Sirdar.
12. Shri J. C. Dasandhi, Mining Sirdar.
13. Shri Syam Baran Gope, Mining Sirdar.
14. Shri Sheo Ram Singh, Mining Sirdar.
15. Shri Bihari Rewani, Shotfirer.
16. Shri R. N. Tewary, Office Clerk.
17. Shri V. V. Chowra, Store-keeper.
18. Shri Misri Lal Nisad, Attendance Clerk.
19. Shri Kapildeo Singh, Attendance Clerk.
20. Shri Awadesh Pandey, Attendance Clerk.
21. Shri Shyam Sunder Singh, Attendance Clerk.
22. Shri S. Mukherjee, Cashier.
23. Shri S. N. Saha, Compounder.
24. Shrimati P. Bhattacherjee, Aya.
25. Shrimati C. R. Saha, C/Nurse.
26. Shri Parbhu Gope, Chaprasi.
27. Shri Mungri Gope, Chaprasi.
28. Shri Sidhhi Gope, Chaprasi.
29. Shri Sohan Ram, Chaprasi.
30. Shri Jang Bahadur, Nepali Chaprasi.
31. Shri Amrit Kahar, Chairman.
32. Shri N. K. P. Choudhury, Bill Clerk.
33. Shri B. D. Sen Gupta, M.O.
34. Shri Sambhu Mallik, H. Kha.
35. Shri Gour Deshwali, H.Kha.
36. Shri Jhari Singh, H.Kha.
37. Shri Sambhu Bagti, T.Kha.
38. Shri Bijoy Kahar, T.Kha.
39. Shri Nebu Rewani, P.Kha.
40. Shri Gopi Hazam, Prop Mistry.
41. Shri Hemraj Barhi, Prop Mistry.
42. Shri G. C. Mahato, P.Mazdoor.
43. Shri Ishwar Malik, P.Mazdoor.
44. Shri Kapil Deo Singh, P. Mazdoor.
45. Shri Rameshwar Kora, Onsetter.
46. Shri Dhadha Nepil, Onsetter.
47. Shri Domra Malaha, Banksman.
48. Shri Kinu Orang, Fitter Mazdoor.
49. Shrimati Postu Harin, Sweeperess.
50. Shrimati Pipita Harin, Sweeperess.
51. Shri Abilash Rewani, Line Mazdoor.
52. Shri Bhusan Mahato No. I, Line Mazdoor.
53. Shri Bhusan Mahato No. II, Line Mazdoor.
54. Shri Jogtu Mahato, Bailing Mazdoor.
55. Shri Rameswar Malik, Bailing Mazdoor.
56. Shri Dhupkal Shaw, Bailing Mazdoor.
57. Shri Prasadi Bowri, Bailing Mazdoor.
58. Shri Mahatam Shaw, Bailing Mazdoor.

59. Shri Bisu Mahato, Onsetter.
60. Shri Bhagela Rajwar, Bailing Mazdoor.
61. Shri Siban Kahar, Fireman.
62. Shri Jharia Routh, Fireman.
63. Shri Amleswar Mahato, Fireman.
64. Shri Nefar Robidas, Fireman.
65. Shri Lakhiram Gorai, U.G. Tram.
66. Shri Nakul Mahato, U. G. Tram.
67. Shri Chetu Mahato, U.G. Tram.
68. Shri Moti Mondal, U.G. Tram.
69. Shri Kailash Dusad, U.G. Tram.
70. Shri Surendra Robidas, U.G. Tram.
71. Shri Sahadeo Mahato, U.G. Tram.
72. Shri Sona Mondal, U.G. Tram.
73. Shri Matru Roy, U.G. Tram.
74. Shri Deoki Dusad, No. II, U.G. Tram.
75. Shri Rajani Mallik, U. G. Tram.
76. Shri Haru Mallik, U.G. Tram.
77. Shri Babulal Mallik, U.G. Tram.
78. Shri Khoda Box Mian, U.G. Tram.
79. Shri Mohan Mallik, U.G. Tram.
80. Shri Guhi Ram Mondal, U.G. Tram.
81. Shri Upendra Robidas, U. G. Tram.
82. Shri Nakul Gorai, U.G. Tram.
83. Shri Faudi Bhulya, Surface Trammer.
84. Shri Ram Subhag Tewari, Surface Trammer.
85. Shri Puna Mahato, Surface Trammer.

If not, to what relief are these workmen entitled?

[No. 2/123/68-LRII.]

BALWANT SINGH, Under Secy.

**(Department of Labour and Employment)**

*New Delhi, the 16th October 1968*

**S.O. 3778.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 5, and section 9, of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (11 of 1948), and in Partial modification of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 2032 dated the 23rd September, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints a Committee consisting of the following members to hold enquiries and advise the Central Government regarding—

- (a) the fixation of minimum rates of wages for the first time under the said Act, and
- (b) the revision of minimum rates of wages already fixed by the Central Government under the said Act,

in respect of the scheduled employment in Manganese, Gypsum, Barytes and Bauxite Mines, and appoints Shri O. Venkatachalam as Chairman thereof, namely:—

**I. Independent Members**

- 1 Shri O. Venkatachalam, Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), New Delhi.—Chairman.
2. Shri K. K. Bhatia, Director, Labour Bureau, Simla.

**II. Employers' Representatives**

1. Shri K. S. Mahapatra, Controller of Indian Bureau of Mines, Nagpur.
2. Sri Dev Coomar Singhi, The Jhagrakhand Collieries Private Ltd., 14/4, Gariahat Road, Calcutta-19.
3. Dr. S. K. Das Gupta, Indian Aluminium Co., Ltd., 1, Middleton Street, Calcutta-16.
4. Shri T. R. Goenka, Honorary Secretary General, Federation of Indian Mining Industries, 7, N.D.S.E. Part I, New Delhi-3.
5. Mr. S. G. A. Naidu, President, Mysore State Mine Owners' Association, Bangalore.

**III. Employees' Representatives**

1. Shri Suraj Narayan Singh, General Secretary, Mica Labour Union, Jhumari-tela, District Hajaribag, Bihar.
2. Shri S. K. Sanyal, Barnala, Nagpur.
3. Shri S. Das Gupta, Secretary, Indian National Mine Workers Federation, Luby Circular Road, Dhanbad.
4. Shri G. M. Khode, General Secretary, Maharashtra Rashtriya Manganese Kamgar Sangh, Itwari, Nagpur.
5. Shri C. L. Tak, Executive Member, Rastriya Gypsum Karamchari Sangh, Jamsar, Bikaner (Rajasthan).

2. In pursuance of Rule 6 of the Minimum Wages (Central) Rules, 1950, the Central Government hereby appoints the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) to be the Secretary of the said Committee.

[No. LWI-I-6 (22)/68.]

**S.O. 3779.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 26 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948, and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) S.O. 1667, dated the 25th May, 1966, the Central Government hereby directs that for a further period of two years with effect from the 27th April, 1968, the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 13 and section 14 of the said Act, in so far as they relate to the regulation of daily hours of work and payment of overtime wages respectively, shall not apply to the pound keepers employed by Cantonment Boards, subject to the condition that the working day of a pound keeper shall be so arranged that, inclusive of intervals of rest, it shall not spread over more than twelve hours on any day.

[No. LWI (I)8(2)(68).]

C. R. NAIR, Under Secy.

**(Department of Labour and Employment)**

*New Delhi, the 17th October 1968*

**S.O. 3780.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following corrections made by Shri Salim M. Merchant, Arbitrator in pursuance of rule 28 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 in his Award issued in the industrial dispute between the management of the Hindustan Zinc Limited, Udaipur and their workmen represented by the Zawar Mines Mazdoor Sangh, Udaipur, and published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) at pages 2625 to 2650 with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), No. S.O. 1931, dated the 24th May, 1968.

*Corrections*

"In para 58 of the Award Part III at page 2645 of the Gazette of India Part II(3)(ii) dated 1st June, 1968 in the first table line two instead of the figure "320", substitute the figure "230" and in the third line of the same table instead of the figure "321" substitute the figure "231".

In the second table in para 58 at page 2645 of the Gazette for the figure "332.50" appearing in grade VII, substitute the figure "362.50" and under Grade IX instead of the figure "295" substitute the figure "260".

[No. F. 36/18/67-LRL]

**S.O. 3781.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, 14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunals, Calcutta in respect of a complaint under Section 33A of the said Act, filed by Shri Samir Kumar Banerjee, Assistant of Commonwealth Assurance Company Limited, Calcutta, which was received by the Central Government on 10th October, 1968.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA**

MISC. APPLICATION NO. 5 OF 1968  
(UNDER SEC. 33A OF I. D. ACT)

**PARTIES:**

Shri Samir Kumar Banerjee, C/o, General Assurance Employees' Association, 24, Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta-12.—*Applicant.*

*Vs.*

M/s. Commonwealth Assurance Company Limited, 23, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.—*Opp. Party.*

**PRESENT:**

Shri B. N. Banerjee,  
Presiding Officer.

**APPEARANCES:—**

*On behalf of Applicant.*—Shri Bhupendra Chandra Das, General Secretary, General Insurance Employees Association, Eastern Region.

*On behalf of Opp. Party.*—Shri C. L. Ganguly, Advocate.

**AWARD**

The applicant, Samir Kumar Banerjee, used to serve as an Assistant in the Rourkela branch office of the Opposite Party Commonwealth Assurance Company Limited. By a notice dated July 8, 1968, his services were terminated with effect from July 15, 1968. The relevant portion of the notice is herein-below set out:

"Due to economic reasons, your services are no longer required and the same are hereby terminated with effect from the 15th July, 1968 with thirty days' salary in lieu of notice.

Please collect your dues from your Branch Secretary as per vouchers enclosed."

2. At the time when the above order was made, there was an industrial dispute pending between the employer company and its employees, in which the applicant was certainly interested. That industrial dispute is still pending before this tribunal and is Reference No. 87 of 1967. On July 30, 1968, the applicant filed the present application under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, therin stating that the employer company had been guilty of contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, in that the employer terminated the services of the applicant, without permission or approval of the tribunal, during the pendency of an industrial dispute in which the applicant was interested. The applicant prayed that this tribunal should pass appropriate orders against the illegal action taken by the employer company.

3. The employer company filed a rejoinder, in which it was, *Inter alia*, stated:

"1(a) The application u/s. 33A is not maintainable in law as much as the applicant has not been dismissed for any misconduct nor has he been punished, but his services have been terminated due to economic reasons as stated in the termination letter issued by the opposite party and served upon the applicant.

\* \* \* \* \*

2. (i) The applicant was appointed as an office assistant at Rourkela Branch of the Company with effect from June, 1967 under the control of the Branch Secretary at Rourkela.

(ii) At the said office at Rourkela, besides the Branch Secretary there were two employees including the Applicant, the other employee being a sub-staff, Sri Raghunandan Prasad.

(iii) For sometime past due to the uneconomic business condition of the Company in some branches including that of Rourkela, the Chairman of the Opposite party concerned decided to economise the cost of maintaining some of the establishments and the Branch Secretary of the Rourkela was also instructed accordingly; it was further decided to close down the branch office at Rourkela and with that view the applicant's services was terminated and he was issued accordingly a letter of termination dated 8th July, 1968.

(iv) That the sub-staff at Rourkela branch office had resigned and his resignation was accepted with effect from 1st August, 1968. No other person has been replaced for the said sub-staff or for the said applicant."

4. At the time of hearing of the application before this tribunal, the applicant was represented by Shri Bhupendra Chandra Das, General Secretary, General Insurance Employees Association, Eastern Region. The applicant did not personally appear or give evidence. On behalf of the employer company, Shri C. L. Ganguly, Advocate, appeared. One Basudev Roy, a Regional Secretary and Accountant of the employer company, gave evidence in support of the action taken by the company. He said in his evidence:

"The head office advised us, by Telex, on May 10, 1968 to close down the Rourkela Branch. \*\*\* Under the law of Insurance, a branch is not allowed to spend more than 37½ per cent of the premium received. In the first quarter of 1968, the expenses at Rourkela rose upto 57½ per cent. \*\*\* in the next quarter the expense rose upto 47 per cent. At Rourkela, there were three employees, the branch Manager, one sub-staff and an office assistant, who is the applicant. The sub-staff resigned at the request of our branch-Secretary. The Rourkela office is in the process of closing and will be closed down very shortly. The applicant was offered his legal dues;" \*\*\*

The cross-examination of this witness was more or less inconsequential.

5. The telex referred to by the witness reads:

"ROURKELA—THIS BRANCH MUST BE CLOSED DOWN BECAUSE THE EXPENSES RATIO IS VERY HIGH\*\*\*"

6. Those are the materials, on which I have to decide whether the employer company contravened the provisions of Sec. 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. That there was an industrial dispute pending before this tribunal at the material time and is still pending is not disputed; that the applicant is interested in the dispute is also not disputed. Further, it is not disputed that the Rourkela office is going to be closed down. The question for my consideration is whether the termination of service of the applicant, as a step in aid of closure of Rourkela branch, invites mischief of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is nobody's case that the termination of service of the workman has not been made by way of a step in aid of closure of the Rourkela branch of the employer company. It was argued before me that the manner of termination of employment of the applicant was discharge from service and discharge *simpliciter* (that is to say discharge not by way of punishment) was also governed by Section 33(2)(b) of the Act. I do not agree. Treated even as a discharge by the employer company, this is not the type of discharge which invites the mischief of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is not disputed that the company was going to close down the Rourkela branch. It is not disputed that in the process of closure another employee, over and above the applicant, has also been got rid of. Since the closure of the Rourkela branch was a reality, the termination of applicant's service on that ground would not fall within the mischief of Section 33 read with Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

7. In the view that I take, I find no substance in this application. The application is, therefore, dismissed. This is my award.

(Sd.) B. N. BANERJEE,  
Presiding Officer.

*Dated, September 25, 1968.*

[No. 74/8/67-LRM.]

## ORDERS

*New Delhi, the 17th October 1968*

**S.O. 3782.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Jaipur Udyog Limited, Sawaimadhopur and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri Gopal Narain Sharma as the Presiding Officer with Headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of the Jaipur Udyog Limited, P.O. Phalodi Quarry, Sawaimadhopur in terminating the services of Shri Bhisham Verma, Incline Driver, with effect from the 9th July, 1968, on grounds of superannuation was legal and justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. 36/29/68-LRI.]

**S.O. 3783.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of White China Clay Mines, Karanjia of Harkarandas Mangilal and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, No. 3, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

1. Whether the action of the management of the White China Clay Mines, Karanjia of Harkarandas Mangilal in refusing employment to Shri Sambhu Koran with effect from the 28th February, 1968 was justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?
2. Whether the dismissal of the said Shri Sambhu Korah by the aforesaid management with effect from the 28th March, 1968 was an act of victimization? If so, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. 36/19/68-LRI.]

## CORRIGENDUM

*New Delhi, the 15th October, 1968*

**S.O. 3784.**—In the Order of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), No. S.O. 4652, dated the 18th December, 1967, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3 Sub-section (ii), at page 4924 to 4927.—in the Schedule,—

- (a) for "without payment", read "with or without payment";
- (b) in the Table,—
  - (i) for the heading "date of lay-off", read "date commencement of lay-off";
  - (ii) in the entries against Sl. No. 7, for "Shri Ram Karamlal Gupta, Clerk", read "Shri R. K. Lal, Senior Clerk";
  - (iii) in the entries against Sl. No. 9, for "Shri L. N. Dass Peon", read "Shri Lall Das, Peon";
  - (iv) in the entries against Sl. No. 15, for "Shri Ramjeewan, Supervisor", read "Shri Ramjeevan, Supervisor";
  - (v) in the entries against Sl. No. 16, for "Shri Mohan Singh, Supervisor", read "Shri Mohan Lal, Supervisor";
  - (vi) in the entries against Sl. No. 17, for "Shri Mohan Singh, Lok", read "Shri Mohan Singh, Clerk";
  - (vii) in the entries against Sl. No. 25, for "Shri Chautia", read "Smt. Chandkhi";
  - (viii) in the entries against Sl. No. 26, for "Shri Jamuna", read "Smt. Jamuna";
  - (ix) in the entries against Sl. No. 27, for "Shri Jethia", read "Smt. Jethki";
  - (x) in the entries against Sl. No. 28, for "Shri Dhape", read "Smt. Dhapo";
  - (xi) in the entries against Sl. No. 29, for "Shri Ladwai", read "Smt. Laduri";
  - (xii) in the entries against Sl. No. 32, for "Shri Chhotu Ram, Driller", read "Shri Chatu Ram, Driller";
  - (xiii) in the entries against Sl. No. 41, for "Shri Ganga s/o Girdhari, Mazdoor", read "Shri Gangla";

(xiv) in the entries against Sl. No. 71, for "Shri Shurey Khan, Shoval Operator", read "Shri Bhurey Khan, Shovel Operator";

(xv) in the entries against Sl. No. 100, for "Shri Nathu Singh, Mate", read "Shri Nathu Shah, Mate";

(xvi) in the entries against Sl. No. 104, for "Shri Gopal Singh, Driver 'A'", read "Shri Gopal Singh, Driller";

(xvii) in the entries against Sl. No. 108, for "Smt. Neerki, Female Mazdoor", read "Smt. Heerki";

(xviii) in the entries against Sl. No. 114, for "Smt. Bhura, Female Mazdoor", read "Smt. Bhuri, Female Mazdoor";

(xix) in the entries against Sl. No. 116, for "Smt. Meera, Female Mazdoor", read "Smt. Heera, Female Mazdoor";

(xx) in the entries against Sl. No. 136, for "Shri Ramadhar Giri, Blaster", read "Shri Ramadhari Giri, Blaster";

(xxi) in the entries against Sl. No. 138, for "Shri Ramjan, Helper", read "Shri Ramzan, Helper".

[No. F.24/35/67-LRI.]

O. P. TALWAR, Under Secy.

**(Department of Labour and Employment)**

**(Office of the Chief Labour Commissioner Central)**

**ORDERS**

*New Delhi, the 16th October 1968*

**S.O. 3785.**—Whereas an application has been made under Section 19 (b) of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 by Messrs. Central Provinces Manganese Ore Co. Ltd. (employer) in relation to their establishments mentioned in the Schedule below for extension of the period for the payment of bonus to their employees for the accounting year ending on 31st December, 1967.

And whereas being satisfied that there are sufficient reasons to extend the time I have, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the proviso to clause (b) of Section 19 of the said Act read with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour & Employment No. WB-20(42)/65, dated the 28th August, 1965, passed orders on 14th Sept., 1968 extending the period for payment of the said bonus by the said employer by 3 (Three) months from the due date under clause (b) of Section 19 of the Act.

Now this is published for information of the employer and all the employees of the said establishment.

**THE SCHEDULE**

Name and address of the employer(s)	Establishment(s)
The Central Provinces Manganese Ore Co. Ltd. P.O. Box No. 8, Nagpur.	Dongri Buzurg Mine.

[No. BA6(3)/68-LSI.]

**S.O. 3786.**—Whereas on an application made by M/s. Satna Stone and Lime Co. Calcutta the period for the payment of bonus to the employees employed in their Raghurajnagar Lime Stone Mines was extended by 2 months from the due date under Sec. 19(B) of Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 *vide* this office letter No. B.A. B(13)/68-LSI., dated 2nd September, 1968 and whereas an application has been made under Section 19(b) of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 by the said Co. for further extension of the period for the payment of bonus to their employees for the said accounting year.

And whereas being satisfied that there are sufficient reasons to extend the time, I have, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the proviso to clause (b) of Section 19 of the said Act read with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of

Labour & Employment No. WB-20(42)/65 dated the 28th August, 1965, passed orders on 11th October, 1968 further extending the period for payment of the said bonus by the said employer upto the end of December, 1968.

Now this is published for information of the employer and all the employees of the said establishment.

[No. B.A. 8(13)/68-LSI.]

O. VENKATACHALAM,  
Chief Labour Commissioner (Central)

(Department of Rehabilitation)

(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

*New Delhi, the 11th October 1968*

**S.O. 3787.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of Sub-Section (2) of Section 16 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints for the Union Territory of Delhi, Shri B. L. Juneja, Assistant Settlement Officer in the office of Regional Settlement Commissioner, New Delhi as Managing Officer for the custody, management and disposal of compensation pool.

[P/F. No. 8/1/55/Comp. I/ARG.]

**S.O. 3788.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (i) of Section 6 of the Administration of Evacuee Property Act, 1950 (XXXI of 1950), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri B. L. Juneja, Assistant Settlement Officer in the office of the Regional Settlement Commissioner, New Delhi as Assistant Custodian for the Union Territory of Delhi for the purpose of discharging the duties assigned to such officers by or under the said Act.

[P/F. No. 8/1/55/Comp. I/ARG.]

A. G. VASWANI,  
Settlement Commissioner (A) and *Ex-Officio*,  
Under Secy. to the Government of India.

(Department of Rehabilitation)

(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

ORDERS

*New Delhi, the 14th October 1968*

**S.O. 3789.**—In pursuance of rule 76-A of the Displaced Persons (Compensation & Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955, the Central Government hereby makes the following order to amend the order published with the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Works, Housing & Rehabilitation (Department of Rehabilitation) No. S.O. 530, dated the 3rd February, 1964, namely:—

In the said order:—

For the words and figures "30th September, 1968" the words and figures "31st March, 1969" shall be substituted.

[No. F. 14(22)/Comp. & Prop/64.]

**S.O. 3790.**—In pursuance of rule 76-A of the Displaced Persons (Compensation & Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955, the Central Government hereby makes the following order to amend the order published with the notification of the Government of India in the

Ministry of Labour, Employment & Rehabilitation (Department of Rehabilitation) No. S.O. 1347 dated the 21st April, 1966, namely:—

In the said Order

- (i) *Delete* the words "except the Bombay region" occurring in the last line of sub-clause (i) of the clause (2);
- (ii) *Omit* sub-clause (ii) of clause (2).

[No. F. 14(22)/Comp. & Prop/64 ]

GULAB L. AJWANI,  
Settlement Commissioner (Comp).

